



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 2023

No. 56

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATURNER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 28, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JAKE LATURNER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN MAGNESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Desert Storm and Battle of Mogadishu veteran, John Magness, for his service to our country and to mourn his recent passing.

Mr. Magness and I graduated from West Point together in 1986, after which he served 9 years in the United States Army. His early aviator years

were spent with the 4th Squadron, 2nd Armored Cavalry Regiment where he was charged with conducting border surveillance in his Cobra gunship along 454 miles of the Iron Curtain after which he spent 4 years with the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment, proudly wearing the Night Stalkers name and supporting units like the Navy SEALs and Army Rangers.

After time spent as a consultant for the United Arab Emirates, Mr. Magness dedicated his time and talent to developing and enriching our communities through his work with Hillwood Development Company.

Where Air Force bases lay vacant and unused, such as Norton Air Force Base, Mr. Magness saw opportunity for flourishing. His efforts led to the commercial and industrial development of the San Bernardino base, now boasting of millions of square feet around the base. Fifteen years after he started this project, the development had contributed over \$2.3 billion for the surrounding community.

On May 18, 2010, Colonel John McHugh, another West Point class of 1986 grad and dear friend of Mr. Magness was killed in action in Kabul, Afghanistan, by a suicide bomber. As a result of his tragic passing and his legacy, the Johnny Mac Soldiers Fund was created by the West Point class of 1986 to help Colonel McHugh's family.

The fund's mission quickly expanded to serve as many families as possible, giving back to those who gave their all. The fund honors military service and sacrifice by providing scholarships to veterans and military family members, especially to the children of fallen servicemembers. It has awarded over \$30 million in scholarship funds since 2014 and supports 4,500 Johnny Mac scholars attending schools across this country.

Having been a close friend of Colonel McHugh and a dedicated supporter of veterans, servicemembers, and their

families, Mr. Magness dedicated himself to the Johnny Mac Soldiers Fund. To raise money and awareness, Mr. Magness undertook the Aconcagua Challenge expedition, tackling the largest mountain outside of Asia located in Argentina.

Undeterred by the 22,837-foot climb and exemplifying the West Point class of 1986 motto, "courage never quits," Mr. Magness summited the mountain after 10 days of climbing, even after two of his three-man team had to cease the climb for medical reasons.

Having conquered the mountain and accomplishing his mission, Mr. Magness succumbed to ensuing medical complications and passed away in the early morning hours of February 5, 2023.

Night Stalkers don't quit even after leaving the military service for the private sector. Mr. Magness was a fierce supporter of the organization's mission and the personification of former President Teddy Roosevelt's "The Man in the Arena," the man stained by "dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly . . . who spends himself in a worthy cause." Mr. Magness died with his boots on serving his country and its heroes.

Mr. Magness is survived by his wife, Angie, and their two children, Chelsea Shelburne and John Michael Magness, Jr. He was also a very proud grandfather of his 2-year-old grandson, Rhett.

His family, friends, and colleagues all describe him as a man of strong Christian faith, a patriot, a loving father, a grandfather, a husband, a soldier, a hero, a servant leader, and a friend. Mr. Magness, or Magger as he was known by his friends, exemplified these characteristics and more, all the while serving the community that he loved so well.

In both his life and in his death, Mr. Magness modeled service for all those around him. I was blessed to have

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1467

known him through our shared time at West Point and as a fellow Night Stalker, and I know he is greatly missed by his family and friends.

John was buried at West Point yesterday, March 27, 2023, where he rests in peace having completed his mission on Earth.

I will finish with the last stanza of the West Point alma mater:

And when our work is done,
Our course on Earth is run,
May it be said, well done
Be thou at peace.
E'er may the line of gray
Increase from day to day
Live, serve, and die, we pray,
West Point, for thee.

Well done, John.

AMERICAN NEEDS MORE ENERGY PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA) for 5 minutes.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week, House Republicans are moving forward with the polluters over people act.

The polluters over people act does nothing to lower energy costs for everyday American families and will increase our deficit by \$2.4 billion. Let me repeat that. It will increase the deficit by \$2.4 billion.

This bill will eliminate bedrock environmental protections, safeguarding public health, and keeping our air and water clean, leaving Americans with higher energy costs.

Instead of tackling climate change, extreme MAGA Republicans are focused on undoing our historic clean energy plan, which has already created 100,000 jobs.

We need more energy production across the board.

Oil and gas workers in my district know that energy jobs can mean a real shot at the American Dream for working families. We shouldn't have to choose between dirty air and polluted water to meet the energy needs of the future.

I see the consequences of pollution within my own district in Houston as we rank eighth in the country for the highest ozone levels.

Neighbors in and around my district face respiratory problems, heart disease, and other health issues caused by exposure to air pollution and smog.

Constituents in my nearby neighborhoods suffer the most, often living in the shadows of these polluting industries.

Houston is not alone. Across the country, we see the impacts of pollution on public health. We have a responsibility to reduce pollution. Clean air is a public health issue. We need to do more to help our communities.

That is why I am fighting for strong, robust funding for clean air programs and air monitoring in my district.

Instead of keeping our families and communities safe, House Republicans

are making it easier for big companies to pollute without consequences.

While House Republicans play games and raise the deficit, House Democrats will do everything to continue to put people over politics—not polluters—every day to meet the real needs of the American people because everyone deserves a good job with benefits and a shot at the American Dream without giving up their right to breathe clean air.

It is our duty and responsibility to protect our God-given right to clean air for ourselves and for our future generations.

We cannot afford to wait any longer.

HONORING ROBERT D. CAMACHO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guam (Mr. MOYLAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I join the people of Guam in not only mourning but honoring the late, great Robert D. Camacho, who sadly left this world last week.

Bob, as he was known to many, was a man of family and faith first before anything. He was a husband, a father, a veteran, a law enforcement officer, and a friend to many.

Bob and I go way back, as we were classmates in our University of Guam Army ROTC days, and he served as my commander at the 368th MP Company Army Reserves in Sumay, Guam. We also worked together at the Department of Corrections, which is where our friendship turned to family, as Bob became the godfather, or nino as we would say, for my eldest daughter Abby.

In recent years, Bob has served the community in the capacity as the director of the Guam Customs and Quarantine Agency, chief of the Guam Airport Authority police department and most recently as the director of Department of Corrections.

Bob will be greatly missed, and with this, and under the sacred and historical Hall, on behalf of the Nation and the island of Guam, I would like to thank Robert D. Camacho for his service to the country and to the people of Guam and express our deepest condolences to his wife, Pauline; his children; his family; and friends.

Bob, may you rest in peace and adios for now, my friend, until we meet again.

HONORING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Women's History Month and the countless women who have given so much to the northeast San Fernando Valley and to our country.

March is dedicated as Women's History Month, and I am proud to be part

of the party that every day in Congress are expanding women's rights, fighting for wage increases, parental leave, and reproductive rights for all and uplift every woman across our great country.

In that spirit, I will be highlighting amazing women trailblazers from the San Fernando Valley who have given so much to our community and to our great country.

HONORING ADA MUNOZ YSLAS

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Ada Munoz Yslas, the former principal of Andres and Maria Cardenas Elementary School.

Daughter of immigrant parents and a proud product of valley schools, Ada has dedicated over 30 years as an excellent educator.

Ada has given so much of herself to thousands of students and fellow educators and parents by inspiring and teaching everyone around her that they can become everything that they aspire to be.

After her career of over 30 years, Ada is now enjoying time with her family.

We thank Ada Munoz Yslas for being an inspirational educator in her well-deserved retirement.

HONORING DR. JUDY F. BACA

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor one of the most amazing painters and muralists in the world, Judy F. Baca. Her art is appreciated all over the world from California to Finland and to El Salvador.

In 1976, Judy began painting a true landmark for the San Fernando Valley: the Great Wall of Los Angeles. It is a half-mile-long mural along the Tujunga waterway that depicts the history of California. Judy inspired and employed over 400 youth to paint this iconic mural in their own community.

In 2017, the Great Wall of Los Angeles received national recognition on the National Registry of Historic Places by the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Just last week, Judy received one of the most prestigious honors an artist can ever receive. President Joseph R. Biden awarded her the National Medal of Arts for her decades of inspirational art.

Dr. Judy Baca will continue to bless us with her art all over the world, and we pray for her continued success.

HONORING CAROLYN ROSE

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Carolyn Rose, one of the founders of the largest antipoverty nonprofits in the San Fernando Valley, Meet Each Need With Dignity, also known as MEND.

In 1976, Carolyn started MEND with her husband, Ed, in their garage in Mission Hills. They collected food and clothing donations and distributed them to the most needy families throughout our community.

MEND has grown to continuously serve the most vulnerable in our community with food distribution, one-on-one case management, and support for low-income families.

Every year, you can see Carolyn leading the Christmas Family Adoption

Program with her dedicated volunteers loading up groceries for Christmas dinner, toys for the kids, and smiles for all to receive.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Carolyn Rose for all that she does for our community.

□ 1015

HONORING ASSEMBLYMEMBER LUZ RIVAS

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor California State Assemblymember Luz Rivas.

Luz was raised by her single immigrant mother and spent her childhood living out of converted garages and back houses in Pacoima. She became the first woman from San Fernando High School to graduate and attend MIT, where she received her engineering degree. Luz then went on to Harvard and achieved a master's degree in education.

After working as an electrical engineer at Motorola, she came back home and started a nonprofit, DIY Girls. DIY Girls inspires thousands of girls every year to believe in themselves and pursue a career in STEM.

Luz was elected to the California State Assembly in June 2018 and continues to serve communities she was raised in, the northeast San Fernando Valley.

As our assemblymember, she is a fierce advocate for all families, expanding education opportunities, and creating green spaces for our communities across our State.

HONORING GOSPEL MUSIC PERFORMER SANDRA CROUCH

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Sandra Crouch, gospel music performer, Grammy Award winner, and copastor at New Christ Memorial Church in Pacoima.

Sandra and her twin brother, Andrae, who is no longer with us, were raised singing gospel music in the church their father founded. Like her brother, she pursued a career in the music industry.

In 1984, she won a Grammy Award for her album "We Sing Praises." On this album, she gave moving performances of songs such as "My Soul Only Loves You" and "No Greater Love."

Sandra's powerful voice continues to enrich the hearts of many in her congregation and community, and we honor her accomplished career and dedication to her community.

SHORE UP OUR AVIATION WORKFORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, as I have said on many occasions on the floor, I am a businessman, and we face a myriad of challenges out there, not just small business but medium and large business, as well.

I also sit on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and Aviation Subcommittee and, in doing so, have

been talking with numerous people in the aviation industry, either talking to them or listening to them in hearings. There is one thing that has been a common theme out there, and that is workforce challenges.

It seems that the cost of joining the aviation family is keeping a lot of people out of choosing this vital career. As the demand for passenger and cargo transportation increases, pilot and mechanic recruitment isn't keeping up.

That is why, today, I am proud to introduce the Aviation Workforce Development Act. It is a commonsense proposal to give Americans who want to pursue a career in aviation, on the ground or in the air, the same tools as those seeking 4-year degrees, with zero increased cost to taxpayers.

This bill will allow Americans with 529 plans to use their money to attend FAA-certified pilot and mechanic training programs. That is it. It is just another way for students to save for a career in aviation.

I thank Representatives JIMMY PANETTA and MIKE KELLY and Aviation Subcommittee Ranking Member STEVE COHEN for co-leading on this effort. I also give a big thank-you to DREW FERGUSON, LUCY MCBATH, JULIA BROWNLEY, and RUSSELL FRY for joining us as original cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling on all Members to join us to help empower more Americans to take to the skies and shore up our aviation workforce.

ENERGY AND CLIMATE RIPE FOR BIPARTISAN COOPERATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, energy security and climate action are ripe for bipartisan cooperation in this Congress. Unfortunately, H.R. 1 is a partisan grab bag that fails to meet the challenge before us and reverses our climate progress in many cases.

H.R. 1 would eliminate the methane emissions reduction program, the greenhouse gas reduction fund, and energy efficiency and electrification incentives that reduce energy demand and costs for Americans, all vital components of the Inflation Reduction Act.

Last week, climate scientists issued their starkest warning yet that the world must cut emissions by 60 percent by 2035 to limit the planet's rise in temperature to 1.5 degrees Celsius. We don't have time to waste refighting the battles of last year.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said they don't want a bill that favors one type of energy over the other. The problem is that their bill, H.R. 1, explicitly favors fossil fuels. It ramps up oil and gas leasing and exploration over the clean, affordable fuels and technologies of the future.

Right now, pipelines that carry fossil fuels are already expedited and given regulatory exemptions, while trans-

mission lines, which transmit electricity long distances from all energy sources, don't get the same preferential treatment. The current system favors fossil fuels, risking our energy and climate security.

Look, it is not all bad. There are pieces of H.R. 1 that I believe we can work together on—a better process for determining the level of review to apply to a project, reusing existing data instead of reinventing the wheel at each step, and creating presumptive timelines for reviews so that projects are not indefinitely stalled. I am more than willing to admit that NEPA, a law from 1970, can be updated to meet today's challenges. In fact, clean energy permit reform is required to meet our climate goals, but this proposal fails to match the scale of our climate challenge.

The current power grid took 150 years to build. To get to net-zero emissions by 2050, we have to triple its size in the next 30 years.

According to Americans for a Clean Energy Grid, North America has built just 7 gigawatts of interregional transmission since 2014, less than half of that in the United States, so let's say 4. South America has built 22, Europe 44, and China 260 gigawatts of interregional transmission.

We currently have enough wind, solar, and storage projects in the pipeline to power nearly 85 percent of our economy, but 80 percent of those projects could be canceled due to insufficient transmission.

This decade, we will need to deploy solar and wind at five to six times our historical record pace. We need to be laser-focused on making it easier, not harder, to build clean energy because all the money in the world can't solve the climate crisis if we leave it in the bank or don't move fast enough.

Our country prides itself on accomplishing big things together, whether it is winning a world war, constructing an interstate highway, or discovering the next big medical breakthrough. During World War II, San Diego war factories built a bomber an hour to help combat fascism and support our Allies. During COVID-19, we developed a vaccine in less than 2 years when 10 to 15 years is the norm. Today, we are debating whether a decade is an appropriate amount of time to construct one single transmission line, an offshore wind facility, or a geothermal plant.

With a climate crisis that requires us to move at scale and speed orders of magnitude greater than ever before, we can't be bogged down in reviews and litigation before we even begin to build a given project.

We can fix our judicial review processes to protect vulnerable communities while preventing wealthy NIMBYS, corporations, and bad actors from blocking essential clean energy projects, which is what is happening right now.

We can reduce the level of review for climate projects on non-sensitive land

while ensuring that polluting projects remain heavily scrutinized.

What we can't do is simply stand by and accept the status quo that is bogging down clean-energy projects that will combat extreme weather and climate catastrophes that threaten vulnerable communities, endangered species, and stable economies.

Mr. Speaker, I am ready for us to get to this vote on a bill that has no chance of becoming law to get it out of the way so that both sides can come together to work on a bipartisan solution. I invite any of my colleagues to come to me and to talk to Chairman WESTERMAN, who has been working with me on that kind of bipartisan solution. The future of our planet depends on it. We have no time to waste.

WELCOMING JOE GARCIA AND MICHAEL MORASCO

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge and welcome Joe Garcia and Michael Morasco, members of the Escondido City Council, to Washington, D.C. It is my great honor to now represent that wonderful city in Congress. I look forward to working with them.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN PATRICK KILBRIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. D'ESPOSITO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a veteran, public servant, and fellow brother in blue, John Patrick Kilbride, better known as Jack.

Jack Kilbride was a man who lived a life of service to the people of America, his fellow Long Islanders, and his comrades from the United States military.

Indeed, as a young man and recent graduate of Division Avenue High School in Levittown, Jack enlisted in the United States Marine Corps in 1967, at the height of the Vietnam war. Jack was sent to Vietnam as a member of the India Company in the 3rd Battalion, 26th Marine Regiment, where he fought valiantly at Khe Sanh and earned two Purple Hearts.

After catching malaria, Jack was sent home, only to be redeployed to Vietnam for a second tour with the 9th Marines, also known as the Walking Dead, a reputation they earned through their valor in combat.

After his honorable discharge from military service, Jack joined the ranks of the Freeport Police Department back on Long Island, where he served that community faithfully for 18 years, also as a member of their PBA.

Upon his retirement from the Freeport Police Department, Jack continued his life of public service by joining Congressman Pete King's staff as his military congressional aide, a position he held for 10 years.

Jack's remarkable record of selfless service truly distinguished him in the community, but Jack was not just a committed public servant. He was also a dedicated family man, as well.

Jack was a loving husband to Virginia, known to many as Ginny; a father to Michael, Kelly, and Kristin; and grandfather to 12 grandchildren, who lit up his world and knew him best as Pop.

He was also the brother to Marine Corps Major Chuck Kilbride, a great man who works on Long Island to make sure underprivileged children see the blessings of the holiday season each and every year by leading our Toys for Tots program.

Upon Jack's death, he marked the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, Marine Corps League, and Law Enforcement Foundation as his friends and comrades in arms.

On this day, I join many friends, and my friend, Major Chuck Kilbride, in remembering the life and legacy of John Kilbride, a man who lived his life in service to his family, his community, and this great Nation.

New York's Fourth Congressional District truly lost an incredible, selfless neighbor, but Jack's memory will live on forever.

May he rest in peace.

RECOGNIZING TRANSGENDER DAY OF VISIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Transgender Day of Visibility.

I am introducing my bill, the Name Accuracy in Credit Reporting Act, legislation that is informed by the lived experiences of transgender and nonbinary people throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and our country.

My bill will rectify the inequities and inaccuracies in credit reporting, which disproportionately impact transgender and nonbinary people.

During their transition, many transgender people choose to legally change their names. However, even after their legal name change is finalized, their credit report continues to deadname them, or refer to them by their prior name.

Deadnaming a trans person in their credit report comes with many harms to one's mental health and financial well-being. When external entities like potential lenders or employers receive the inaccurate credit reports, transgender folks are exposed to discrimination and harassment in credit services, housing, and employment.

Further, some trans and nonbinary consumers have reported that when they change their name, the credit bureaus fragment their credit report, resulting in a loss of credit history and a drop in their credit score.

My bill will improve accuracy in consumer reporting and increase access to housing, jobs, and credit for transgender and nonbinary people by

preventing their unfair denials that result after a name change.

□ 1030

The status quo is unjust, inaccurate, and unsafe for transgender and nonbinary people. We know that the credit bureaus can easily make these changes. They do this every day when people change their name to get married. It is past time that we realize trans justice is economic justice.

My bill has the support of key advocates and trusted voices, but most importantly, it is endorsed by transgender and nonbinary people who have been impacted by these issues. I am a firm believer that the people closest to the pain should be the closest to the power, driving and informing the policymaking.

On this Transgender Day of Visibility, may we, as Members of Congress, renew our efforts to condemn transphobia in all of its forms. The rhetoric is harmful, the policy is violent, and it stands to harm our most vulnerable and marginalized communities.

May we stand with trans students who deserve to learn in a school environment free from hate. May we stand with the parents who are raising trans children fighting to make a safer world for them. May we stand with the community organizers, movement builders, and status quo disrupters who are on the front lines of trans liberation. May we do more than espouse the values of equality and freedom but actually practice them to include all people.

When we say Black lives matter, that must include Black trans lives. In the fight for human rights, we must affirm that trans rights are human rights. When we evoke the words of Fannie Lou Hamer that nobody is free until we all are free, that must include our siblings in the trans community.

No doubt, the trans community, our neighbors and loved ones, have experienced disparate harm, hardship, and violence. But the transgender community is certainly much more than their pain and trauma. I thank them for showing up every day as their authentic selves and living their lives unapologetically. I thank them for the roles they play every day as public officials, as small business owners, as veterans, and more.

This is true across our country, including in my district, the Massachusetts 7th.

Organizers like Tre'Andre Carmel Valentine, who advocates for trans and nonbinary folks and has established a leadership academy to create new opportunities for employment and education.

De'zyre Dupree Lewis, who serves as a lead community health worker helping residents throughout the district access needed care.

Armani Pasqual, another leader who is dedicated to transformational change and manages a reentry program and combats hunger among those experiencing housing insecurity.

They, and so many others in the trans community, are rightfully taking up space while simultaneously creating space, utilizing their talents and skills to shape the Massachusetts 7th and beyond into a stronger and more beautiful place to live.

I am truly humbled to serve as their Congresswoman, and I will never stop fighting for bold and intentional policy solutions that promote and support their healing, safety, and justice.

CONDEMNING KIDNAPPING OF UKRAINIAN CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, 16,226 children in Ukraine have been taken from their families by Russia through forced transfers and deportations between February 24, 2022, and March 22, 2023. Let me say it again. 16,226 Ukrainian children have been taken from their homes and sent to Russia. Most people call this act kidnapping or abduction.

In March, the United Nations Human Rights Council determined that the Russian actions are a violation of human rights. On March 17, the International Criminal Court issued an arrest warrant for President Putin for these kidnappings.

When the Russians take these children, they are sent to “reeducation camps” where they wait until a Russian foster family is found.

What lies are told to these children? That their family is dead?

In the case of 12-year-old Sashko, the Russians told him his mother “no longer needed him.”

In March of 2022, Sashko and his mother, Snizhana, were captured in Mariupol and separated in the Russian camp, not even allowing them to say goodbye to each other. Sashko was taken to have an eye injury treated and was then placed in an orphanage. After some time, he found a phone and secretly called his grandmother. She gathered all of his documents and risked her own freedom and possible detainment to go and get him. The love of a grandmother.

With his grandmother’s efforts, his courage, and the assistance of a large network of government and nongovernment entities, they were happily reunited. Sadly, they have not heard from his mother or even know where she is.

While this story is hopeful, there are only 307 other children who share the same happiness of being returned to their families in Ukraine, which means there are approximately 16,000 missing Ukrainian children in Russia. We must join and support the Child Rights International Network, Bethany Christian Services, Voices of Children, and approximately 34 other organizations who are working together to save these children.

The concurrent resolution we are proposing and submitting today

strongly condemns this practice by Russia. This practice was employed by ruthless dictators like Adolf Hitler, Joseph Stalin, Mao Zedong, Pol Pot, Augusto Pinochet, and other sadistic tyrants. Today, we can add Putin to that terrible list.

Children everywhere should be protected from the cruelty of being ripped from their families and trafficked to another nation to be “reeducated” and placed with a foreign family under the guise of the child not having a family.

This resolution rebukes nations who provide aid and support to the Russian kidnapping enterprise. It condemns the forced adoption of Ukrainian children and implores Russia to work with international human rights and child welfare organizations to ensure the return of Ukrainian children to their home country and their families.

We should have zero moral ambiguity when it comes to Putin. He is a war criminal and is committing barbaric human rights violations. He should be a global outcast and be held accountable.

I thank Senator KLOBUCHAR for introducing the companion legislation in the Senate, and I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in this mission of getting the Ukrainian children home.

THANK YOU TO THE LINE WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. PEREZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the line workers in my district. They are literally keeping the lights on.

When ice storms hit, when the winds are hitting 60-miles-an-hour in my district, when we are warm in bed, the folks who work on the power lines are getting in their trucks and they are working in these conditions to keep and get the lights on.

Power transmission is not sexy. It does not get the status and the attention that a Tesla does or that many of our electrification projects do. But transmission is critical for grid resiliency and clean energy. We have got to focus our efforts on increasing transmission capacity.

I take this opportunity to specifically thank the linemen in my county, Skamania County. A few weeks ago, we had a huge winter storm. I woke up to 20 inches. A lot of people like me get our water from a well, so when the power is out, we don’t have water.

From the bottom of my heart, I thank all of those line folks who are keeping the power on, getting up in the middle of the night, and taking care of our power supply.

FUNDING FOR WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about water infrastructure in my community.

A few weeks ago, I was reviewing congressional funding requests, and one pervasive theme that came up over

and over was municipal water infrastructure problems in the district. This issue touches every county in my district and every home, from Underwood to Long Beach to Washougal.

Over and over, we see infrastructure that is past its recommended life span, undersized, or on the brink of collapse, frankly. In order to resolve this, communities are forced to either slap a Band-Aid on it or take out massive loans. Some wastewater systems are also beginning to fail, and they have been releasing sewage into the environment, which places a lot of people at risk.

Local governments alone can’t address this issue. In the past, the government has mandated state-of-the-art equipment, essentially requiring that these folks put a Lamborghini sewer system in when what they really need is a Toyota Corolla. This makes it incredibly expensive and difficult to keep up with maintenance in a small community.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass Federal legislation that will ensure all Americans have access to clean energy.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG SHORTAGES

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the drug shortages happening across the country.

Like most Americans, I live on a budget. My monthly prescription just went from \$16 a month to \$250 a month, and we are seeing this across the board. We are seeing shortages in Infants’ Tylenol and in cough syrup. We have shortages of vital drugs. It is becoming incredibly difficult for everyday people to keep up with the cost of these necessary medications.

No surprise, Big Pharma can find the capacity to manufacture the expensive on-brand drugs, and they are actively stonewalling efforts to produce the generic drugs that working families can actually afford.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to address this critical issue and ensure folks across the Nation can access their medications.

IN SUPPORT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of law enforcement officers in my district and across the Nation.

The national starting wage for police officers is \$67,000 annually. That is not very much, folks. These are careers that we are asking people to step into the line of fire for us, and these wages do not reflect the risks of the job.

As a result, no surprise, recruitment and retention of good officers is the top issue facing law enforcement agencies across the country. But our Federal priorities don’t reflect this necessity. We are continually funding capital projects and not operating expenses. So while the cost of living is going up and up and up, we are funding, I kid you not, body cameras for dogs.

In my district, one of my local sheriff’s offices received Federal funding

for dog body cameras at a time when their deputy wages are struggling to keep up with the cost of living. We have got to make sure Federal resources are being spent wisely, not on, literally, pet projects.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in working to realign our Federal spending to reflect the real issues facing law enforcement.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF LARRY CASSIDY

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Larry Cassidy.

When I first met Larry, I remember how amazed I was by his constant positivity. Larry was born in Portland but moved to Vancouver, the good side of the river, his home since 1966. He was a husband, father, and grandfather. He was passionate about salmon and steelhead in the Northwest and was a community activist and conservationist before receiving a Governor-appointed position on the Washington Game Commission.

Sadly, Larry passed away in January of this year after battling prostate cancer for 25 years.

I thank Larry for being a friend and a mentor. I stand with my community in being grateful to Larry for all he did in Washington's Third Congressional District.

RECOGNIZING ROGER CORDLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Private Second Class Roger Cordle. This U.S. Army veteran passed away on January 15, 2023, but not without making a strong impact on our community.

Mr. Cordle was awarded numerous medals and ribbons during his military career, including the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal for serving during Operation Just Cause.

Mr. Cordle's dedication to service continued as the commander of VFW Post 2535 in Lockport, New York, and as commander of New York State VFW Post in District 7, which oversees Niagara, Orleans, Wyoming, Livingston, and Genesee Counties. During his time as commander of VFW Post 2535, the post was recognized as an all-state post for several years, one of only 24 in the State of New York.

As a leader in our community, Mr. Cordle was active in many of Post 2535's charity events, including providing holiday meals to veterans and families in need and also assisting homeless veterans.

Please join me in celebrating the life of Private Second Class Roger Cordle, who is survived by his beloved wife and five children.

His was a life well lived, and his commitment to this great Nation is an inspiration to us all.

CELEBRATING THE BICENTENNIAL OF HOBART COLLEGE

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the bicentennial of Hobart College.

2022 marked the 200th anniversary of Hobart's founding in Geneva, New York, making it one of America's 50 oldest colleges and universities.

When Hobart College, first named Geneva College, was founded in 1822, the United States was less than 50 years old, Washington, D.C., had been the Nation's capital for only 21 years, and Abraham Lincoln was just 13 years old. The college was located on the land of the Seneca Nation that for generations was the Haudenosaunee Confederacy's westernmost territory.

Hobart College was named after New York's third Episcopal Bishop, John Henry Hobart. Given Geneva's vibrant community, he saw the beautiful city as the perfect place to establish a college with the mission of educating students with a comprehensive liberal arts curriculum.

In 1908, Hobart's sister school, William Smith College for Women, was founded, which eventually merged in 1943 with Hobart to become Hobart and William Smith Colleges.

Both colleges have an impressive legacy of producing men and women of leadership and national impact, including graduates like Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, who became the first American woman to receive a medical degree in 1849, and Harry W. Coover, Jr., the inventor of Super Glue.

Countless other Hobart and William Smith graduates have made profound contributions to public service, business, education, science, journalism, and spiritual life that endured well beyond their lifetimes. Indeed, my brother John, my cousin Jeff, and many of my friends are graduates of Hobart and William Smith Colleges.

Today, Hobart College educates students from around the world who study on a campus of incomparable beauty. Guided by programs grounded in exploration and intellectual curiosity, both Hobart and William Smith Colleges challenge students to engage in critical and creative thinking. Under the faculty's mentorship, Hobart and William Smith students have won multiple prestigious fellowships like the Rhodes, Gates Cambridge, Fulbright, and Goldwater scholarships.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Hobart College on this historic milestone and wish the Hobart and William Smith Colleges community all the best as it continues to produce the next generation of leaders and innovators across the world.

□ 1045

HONORING DIANA VESGA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I want to highlight a Latina trailblazer, Diana Vesga. This remarkable woman is the chief operating officer of the Los

Angeles County Museum of Art, the largest art museum in the western United States.

Prior of joining the museum in 2014, she worked as an investment banker and as a senior executive at Univision.

A Colombian immigrant, she is one of the few Latinas in art museum leadership and only one of a few women to hold a chief operating officer position among the top art museums in the country. Just 10 percent of museum administrators nationwide are Hispanic or Latino, and even fewer are Latinas.

Diana grew up in a family of artists and art leaders and has used her unique perspective to embrace and value all cultures as the museum expands. As the new Smithsonian Museum of the American Latino is in development, we could use her wisdom and the wisdom of other Latinas and Latinos in the industry.

Mr. Speaker, Diana is an inspiration to Latinas everywhere.

SUPPORT MEDICAID FUNDING

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support funding for Medicaid, a crucial program saving millions of lives, including Latino lives.

Eager to balance our budget on the backs of poor people, my Republican colleagues have proposed extreme cuts to Medicaid. Medicaid has served and transformed millions of lives, especially in minority communities. Medicaid has been a vital lifeline for Latino communities which face disproportionate health crises, from diabetes to mental illness.

Since 2013, Medicaid expansion has cut the rate of uninsured Latinos in half, and Latino youth now make up over a third of children on Medicaid. This is a critical program and critical coverage for Latino communities.

It means a little boy struggling with chronic depression has access to mental health care. It means a working daughter can spend more time at home caring for her mother with Alzheimer's. It means less medical debt, fewer hospitalizations, and greater access to preventative care.

To cut costs, Republicans have suggested we impose work requirements, cut funding, or repeal the Affordable Care Act all together. All of these ideas would strip healthcare coverage from poor Americans who depend on Medicaid.

Republicans claim they want to balance our budget. In reality, they want to slash critical programs for underserved groups. The single mother of three who spends all day taking care of her children should not lose access to healthcare. The disabled senior who can't survive outside of an assisted living facility should not lose access to healthcare. The little girl with leukemia whose immigrant parents can't afford a cancer screening should not lose access to healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to protect Medicaid and invest in expanding it. Millions of Americans are depending on it.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Humble us, O Lord, as we pray for this Nation. As proud as we are of the greatness of its strength, the resilience of its people, the equity of its government, yet we are reminded too often that our children still die at the hands of the disgruntled. Evil will find a way, even into the sanctum of schoolrooms.

In our humility, we pray You forgive our sin and heal our land.

Guide us, O Lord, as we seek to serve this Nation. As dedicated as each of us may be, as noble as our cause, as devoted to upholding what is right, nonetheless, our country is as deeply divided as it has ever been, and our steps have departed far from the path You would have us follow.

As You call us to yield to Your will, we pray You forgive our sin and heal our land.

Speak through our hearts, O Lord, when we, as a nation, engage one another. As passionate as we are to speak out of deep concern for our future, as compelling our words in the defense of freedom, liberty, and justice, more often than not, our intent is misinterpreted for selfish gain, our compassion mistaken for judgment, our collegiality for weakness.

As we seek to reflect Your truth, one with another, as compatriots of these United States, we pray You forgive our sin and heal our land.

May Your eyes and Your heart be attentive to the prayer that is made in this place as we offer it in Your holy name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

BIDEN ENERGY CRISIS AFFECTS FAMILIES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, every day, American families experience the failed policies of Biden and Democrats.

On the day Biden was sworn in, the average price of gas was \$2.39. Today, it is \$3.44, 44 percent higher. The Biden war on energy resulted in a high cost of over \$5 last year.

During the same period, the first week of his Presidency, Biden killed the Keystone pipeline, which would supply 800,000 barrels of oil a day from Canada, with the mining equipment in Alberta using Michelin tires made in South Carolina.

The idiotic war on fossil fuels subverts science and common sense, and it causes dependence on China for batteries, panels, blades, by Biden.

This week, House Republicans have all-of-the-above legislation to reduce inflation, create jobs, and return America to energy independence with the innovative bill by Congressman JEFF DUNCAN of South Carolina.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, who successfully protected America for 20 years in the global war on terrorism as it continues, sadly, moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America.

Our sympathies to the families of Nashville and Mississippi.

WEAPONS OF WAR DON'T BELONG IN OUR STREETS

(Mrs. MCBATH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, once again, and again, and again, and again, because our children are being murdered in their classrooms. This is outrageous, and it is unconscionable.

Why have we not made good on our promise to our Nation, our promise that our kids can laugh and learn and play in their schools without the fear of a shootout?

We should not need sandbags in our schools to protect our children. They should not be forced to live in a war zone where bullets may murder a classmate at a moment's notice.

What will it take? How much blood must be spilled? How many kids must be killed until we do the right thing?

We are here to protect our communities, and Congress has lost its way. We have lost our soul, and we must do better than this.

Weapons of war don't belong in our streets or our classrooms. How many children must die before we learn that?

CONGRATULATING SALEM HIGH SCHOOL FORENSICS TEAM

(Mr. CLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Salem High School forensics team for winning its 17th consecutive State championship.

The team won 5 of the 10 categories, while also finishing runner-up and third place in another 2 events. These champions include Kade Lakin and Grayson Mitchell for serious duo, Emma Snead for impromptu speaking, Ryan Long for original oratory, Connor Smythers for humorous interpretation, and Courtney Bowen for serious prose.

Ben Hathaway and Kyra Netting finished second in the humorous duo category, and Colton Easter placed third in the prose category.

Since becoming coach in 2001, Coach Mark Ingerson has instilled in the students to work for and help each other as a team, bolstering their success.

With public speaking skills, the future is bright for all of these students, no matter the path they choose.

Congratulations to the participants, parents, coaches, and staff for making this milestone possible.

DON'T ERASE OUR HISTORY

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, this is the close of Virgin Islands History Month. Throughout the Virgin Islands this past month of March, young children have learned about extraordinary Virgin Islanders.

They have learned about Alexander Hamilton, who comes from the island of St. Croix, and learned about this being the only place in the United States on which Christopher Columbus actually set foot.

They learn about the inventions and work of Virgin Islanders in our history, but they also learn about the oppression, about the brutality under Danish rule.

They learn about Alexander Hamilton, his fieriness coming from the fact that he was deemed an illegitimate child and his parentage was constantly questioned.

Last week, House Republicans passed H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act. Under that act, much of that history would be forbidden. Much of that history would be erased.

That is the American story—of resilience, of oppression, of the constant

fight for freedom, of the change that we all are coming together as Americans.

Let's not erase all of our history.

RECOGNIZING THE AMERICAN FLOOD COALITION

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend congratulations to the American Flood Coalition. They celebrated 5 years of driving solutions to build resilience in the face of flooding just this past Sunday.

As a nonpartisan group of cities, elected officials, military leaders, businesses, and civic groups, the American Flood Coalition provides a platform to advocate for a unified voice for solutions to flooding.

My district in north Texas knows firsthand the destruction caused by extreme weather and floods, including in 2015, when Ray Roberts, Grapevine, Lewisville Lakes flooded after sudden heavy rainfall.

I recently joined the coalition as a Federal champion, and I look forward to working with the American Flood Coalition and other Members of Congress on long-term solutions that speed up the recoveries, boost local economies, and prepare us for what lies ahead.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, LOWER ENERGY COSTS ACT

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 260 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 260

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to lower energy costs by increasing American energy production, exports, infrastructure, and critical minerals processing, by promoting transparency, accountability, permitting, and production of American resources, and by improving water quality certification and energy projects, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed seven hours, with three hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees, three hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees, and one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees. After

general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my good friend and the ranking member on the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule, House Resolution 260, providing for consideration of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1 under a structured rule. It provides 7 hours of general debate, with 3 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their designees. Additionally, the rule provides for 3 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their designees, and 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their designees.

Further, this rule makes in order 37 amendments and provides 1 motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation. H.R. 1 unleashes American energy, and it immediately will lower costs for families by resuming lease sales on Federal lands and waters. It will repeal fee increases on energy production, and it will end the moratorium on coal leasing.

Additionally, H.R. 1 strengthens America's critical mineral supply, prohibits a moratorium on hydraulic fracking, and streamlines the permitting process.

Let's remember, on day number one of his Presidency, President Biden launched a war on American energy. He canceled the Keystone XL pipeline, also, by the way, killing tens of thousands of union jobs, and he paused new and oil gas leases on Federal lands. That was day number one.

Under President Trump, we had independence with U.S. energy, but, now, President Biden has drained our Strategic Petroleum Reserve to the lowest level since 1983. That is the lowest level since I have been alive.

Meanwhile, the administration is increasing regulations on domestic energy production by easing regulations and incentivizing energy production in foreign, communist, and authoritarian states like Venezuela.

□ 1215

In the words of President Biden, climate change is the existential threat to humanity. Apparently, that only applies when the U.S. is the one producing the oil and gas, not when nations like Venezuela produce the natural gas.

President Trump, by contrast, opened 100 million acres of public land and water to exploration. But Biden has leased fewer acres of Federal land for oil and gas drilling than any President since the end of World War II. The results have directly impacted all Americans.

On the day Joe Biden took office, the average price for a gallon of gasoline was \$2.39. Today, the national average is \$3.47. That is a 44 percent increase. And let's not forget June's highest rate of \$5 a gallon.

Due to inflation, the average American family is now paying \$10,000 more in household costs under President Biden.

By leaving our resources in the ground and turning to places like Russia, Iran, and Venezuela for help, Democrats are choosing to increase energy costs and risk the national security of American families.

Why? All to appease far-left, radical activists, since they, the Democrats, lack the moral clarity to do what is right for our citizens.

However, instead of focusing on lower energy costs, this administration thinks the most pressing energy issue is—wait for it—banning our gas stoves. That is their priority. Don't take my word for it. While the administration is now gaslighting the American people,

saying they don't stand for this, in places like New York, they have already taken the lead by announcing just yesterday they will ban gas stoves in new buildings.

Americans shouldn't have to choose between driving to work, paying their electric bills, or putting food on the table. We have to lower energy costs for Americans. We have to do it now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to consider a rule for H.R. 1, a bill that might as well be called the polluters over people act. It is yet another example of how this majority, instead of helping everyday Americans, is doing the bidding of their deep-pocketed friends.

We had another mass shooting yesterday, but Republicans won't lift a finger because of the gun lobby. We had another train derailment this week, but Republicans won't lift a finger because of the polluters. Our planet is on fire, but Republicans won't lift a finger because of Big Oil.

Banks are going under, but Republicans want to deregulate more to help their friends on Wall Street. They want to protect kids from what teachers teach in the classroom but not against lead pipes in schools. They say they want to stop inflation but won't go after the billionaire corporations who aren't paying any taxes while they rip people off.

Time after time after time, Republicans continue to put politics over people, and it shows. Anyone who spends 2 seconds reading this bill can see that it is a dirty energy, pro-polluter plan that would drag our economy back decades. This bill puts polluters over people. It makes it easier for companies to strip public lands of their resources and harder to hold corporate polluters accountable for the mess they make. It gives more handouts to Big Oil, as if the industry's CEOs and shareholders haven't already raked in enough money with record profits over the last few years. It guts half a century of environmental protections that ensure the air we breathe and the water we drink is clean, and it sets our country back as the rest of the world moves toward a clean energy future.

There will be plenty of time for us to talk about all the damage the polluters over people act could do to our country and communities, but let me just highlight a few of the worst.

First, it increases the national deficit by half a billion dollars. Considering how much we hear from our colleagues across the aisle about the deficit and the deficit and the deficit, it is fascinating that their most important bill blows a hole in the deficit. So

much for their commitment to fiscal discipline. Don't take my word for it, just consult the CBO. It is a little bit ironic on a day that they are asking that there be dramatic cuts in all kinds of programs that help people in this country, they come up with this bill and add close to a half a billion dollars to our deficit.

Second, it is a job killer. This bill will kill jobs. Over the last few years, Democrats have invested in building a homegrown, clean energy system so we don't have to rely on foreign cartels like OPEC and greedy Big Oil companies for our energy. Investing in these clean energy projects meant we created millions of clean energy jobs. The polluters over people act would kill these jobs and pull our country off course from our path toward a cleaner, cheaper energy future.

Third, it makes it easier to pollute, and it makes it easier for companies to get away with polluting. Just yesterday, a local grandfather in East Palestine, Ohio, detailed the pain caused by the terrible toxic spill there. He said he has "never cried this much in his life." His young granddaughters developed blotches all over their bodies, and their eyes were burning.

This bill would mean more billionaire corporations getting away with polluting without being held accountable, more wells with toxic chemicals, more days where windows are shut because the air is not safe to breathe, more kids diagnosed with asthma because the air quality is so poor.

The worst part is that the Republicans do not care. Their bill literally puts polluters over the people we are here to serve. It forces American taxpayers to foot the bill for cleanup while billionaire corporations dump their toxic waste on our communities. This is sick.

Look at what is happening to our planet, Mr. Speaker. Year after year, the warmest ever recorded; species going extinct at rates not seen in millions of years; sea levels rising and coastal communities feeling the impact; farmers struggling to cope with changing seasons, unprecedented droughts, and crop failures. The answer from my Republican friends is more fossil fuels, more pollution, more drilling, more toxic waste dumped into our communities, more giveaways for Big Oil, and nothing, not a single thing, to lower energy prices.

This bill might as well put ExxonMobil and Chevron in charge of our response to climate change. It might as well put Norfolk Southern in charge of chemical safety. It is a terrible bill that will shackle us to dirty fossil fuels for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just in rebuttal, my friend and Chairman BRUCE WESTERMAN put it

best. He said when the Democrats talk about polluters over people, what they are actually referring to is not this bill. It is actually a reference to where we are now, thanks to Democratic reckless and radical policies.

Right now, China is actually the largest emitter of CO₂. Russian gas is much dirtier than gas from other places around the world, especially the United States where we have cheap, reliable, and clean natural gas. But instead of taking advantage of our God-given resources, Democrats and their reckless, radical policies make us more dependent on these forms of energy that are much dirtier.

My good friend from Massachusetts said this bill will drag us back decades. Well, I do want this bill to take us back, not decades, but just to a few years ago when we had a Republican in the White House. Let us not forget that the United States, again, we currently lead the world in CO₂ emission reduction, but between 2018 and 2019, the total reported greenhouse gas emissions from large facilities fell nearly 5 percent. Yeah, let's go back. Let's go back to that time.

I find the talk about costs somewhat interesting because only in Washington, D.C., only in a place that lacks logic and accountability like Washington, D.C., can future revenue be considered a cost. Think about that. It is considered a cost. The math does not make sense.

It is also quite fascinating that my friends across the aisle are now talking about deficits, which in the last 4 years they voted for over \$4 trillion of increases to spending.

Before I yield to my good friend from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, I will point out a real-life example of what happens when we follow far-left, Democratic environmental policies.

Often I wish that we had a real-life example that we could talk about in terms of policy, and here we do. It is called Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka, trying to search for a great ESG score to—I don't know, appease globalists, appease the ruling elite, appease woke Wall Street investors—they went for this ESG score and right now they are almost a failed state. Sri Lanka's green new deal, to be clear, was a human disaster. It is an ill-advised national experiment.

Let me explain it. They went to organic farming. Organic farming yielded nothing but starvation, poverty, and chaos. President Rajapaksa, with no warning, with no attempt to teach farmers how to cope with change, announced a ban on all synthetic fertilizers and pesticides. Again, he was after that ESG score.

Ninety percent of Sri Lankan farmers relied on synthetic fertilizers. After the ban, 85 percent of farmers experienced crop loss. The damage done by this organic order was so extensive that the former President had to reverse himself less than 7 months later.

Now, let's just bring this to political reality, the goals of the United States,

where only 20 percent of electricity is powered by renewable energy, 20 percent renewable, and less than 10 percent of American families own an electric vehicle. By the way, those that own electric vehicles are overwhelmingly people who make over six figures a year. It is not your average Americans who are driving around in Teslas. Yet, the left seeks to unilaterally ban all hydrocarbons and instill these pipe dreams that the U.S. will generate all of its energy through wind and solar.

All you have to do is look at California to see what comes next. Last August, Governor Newsom announced that they will ban the sale of gasoline cars by 2035. Just 1 week later, after that announcement, the electric grid was overwhelmed in California, and the State had to ask EV owners to limit when they plugged in their vehicles to charge.

So if you ask yourself: Where does the policy of the left lead us? Look no further than to the idiocy of the policy in California and look no further than to the almost failed state of Sri Lanka. That is where these reckless, radical policies will lead the U.S. economy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), the good doctor, my good friend, and fellow Rules Committee member.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do want to rise in support of the rule and in support of the underlying bill.

It is interesting that our Secretary of Energy, Secretary Granholm, came to Austin, Texas, 3 or 4 weeks ago and talked about how we should learn from the communist Chinese and their approach to climate change. Talk about putting polluters over people. If she would consult her own energy information agency, she would see that China gets 55 percent of its energy from coal, whereas the United States gets 11 percent of its energy from coal.

Guess what? China is building more and more coal-fired plants each and every week that goes by.

So who, indeed, is putting polluters over people?

I submit it is this administration, and in the last Congress it was congressional Democrats.

This bill before us today is a culmination of years of hard work by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Natural Resources, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. It is a critical step forward.

One of the things that I have worked on for a number of years is the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act. It is included in this bill. I think it is critically important, not just for a State like Texas but, literally, the entire country. I am grateful that other Republicans Members saw fit to include this legislation as we seek to address the obstacles preventing Americans from actually achieving lower energy costs.

In less than 2½ years, we have gone from relative energy abundance to energy scarcity. We have gone from energy affordability to energy unaffordability.

Why in the world would we want to continue down that pathway?

□ 1230

H.R. 1 also contains the repeal of section 50131 of the Inflation Reduction Act. This provided a billion dollars to coerce State and local governments into adopting costly energy codes. If these grants were allowed to stand, they would take away local control over energy code adoption and Federalize these overreaching mandates.

Efforts to push costly and restrictive energy codes across the country overburden new construction and largely ignore the energy performance of the existing housing stock. New homes built to modern codes are already energy efficient, and further increases in that stringency must be carefully considered because, in fact, we are not doing that with these grant programs.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the Congress started with what was called the American Rescue Plan. It brought us high inflation and it brought us high prices. This is truly the American Rescue Plan. Let's put energy affordability back within the reach of the average American.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues seem to want to debate energy policy in China and in Sri Lanka. That may be a fascinating topic, but that is not what we are here debating. We are here debating energy policy in the United States of America.

I don't want us to go down the path of more fossil fuels and reliance on more energy sources that are going to contribute to climate change. I want us to lead the world toward a greener and cleaner energy future. I guess the question really here is: Who do you trust?

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, their argument is basically: Trust the big oil companies. Give them unfettered access. Give them more money and they will lower your prices. Really?

They have the capacity to produce more now, but they are not, and they are gouging people at the pump. Does anybody believe that the CEOs of these big oil companies making record profits give a damn about average people in this country, about your constituents or my constituents? Give me a break. All they care about is profits. That is the question that people have to answer: Who do you trust? Do you trust the big oil companies?

I certainly don't after the way they have behaved—not just recently, but over time. They gouge people all the time.

The other stuff is fascinating, but we can talk about Sri Lanka at some other time. I would rather talk about the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that affirms the House's unwavering commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare, and states that it is the position of the House of Representatives to reject any cuts to these programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Social Security and Medicare are the cornerstone of our Nation's social safety net. These vital programs are under threat as my Republican colleagues continue to demand reckless cuts in exchange for paying our Nation's bills.

Some Republicans have recently claimed that they won't cut Social Security or Medicare benefits. Mr. Speaker, that empty rhetoric has not been reassuring to the American people who continue to fear that these programs will be slashed by my Republican friends.

Today, once again, Democrats are giving Republicans a chance to back up their claims with action by providing them with a chance to reassure the American people, not just with their words, but with their votes. Today, they can vote unequivocally that they will not cut these vital programs. Anything short is an empty promise.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Vermont (Ms. BALINT), to discuss our proposal.

Ms. BALINT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that the House can address more serious matters like the future of seniors' hard-earned benefits.

Bringing forth H. Res. 178 gives this body the opportunity to finally affirm our commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

This is what American families want us focused on. When I talk to Vermont families, they are concerned with putting food on the table, with keeping their families safe, with how to afford lifesaving medications, not with propping up corporate polluters at the expense of our future.

Americans need us, on the record, promising that families won't have to choose between essentials like medication, food, and housing. Cutting Social Security and Medicare hurts the poorest and most vulnerable among us. These programs support seniors to age with dignity. They support Americans with disabilities to receive the security that they absolutely depend on.

We are not going to let Social Security benefits go away—we are not. Over 65 million Americans rely on hard-

earned Social Security benefits—65 million. These programs are how we preserve the American middle class, and it is how we support all of the working families in each of our districts.

We need to expand the infrastructure and funding of these programs to fully support seniors in their retirement. We owe them this.

Mr. Speaker, I want all Americans to know, Americans are not going to stop fighting to protect your hard-earned benefits. Again, I urge my colleagues to turn their attention to real issues that impact real American families, and defeat the previous question.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to help senior citizens and if we want to help the working class, we can make sure that the working class and seniors on a fixed income can actually pay their heating bills.

According to Ipsos polling, one in three Americans have reported trouble affording gas in Biden's energy crisis. Almost 35 percent of Americans, over 40 million, use a gas stove. The Democrats want to ban the gas stove.

Let's talk about the economic pain that is coming to all Americans. Electricity prices are expected to rise over 11 percent this winter. Natural gas prices are expected to rise as much as 25 percent since last winter. About 47 percent of households use natural gas to heat their homes, by the way.

Heating home oil prices are expected to rise as much as 45 percent since last winter. Over 80 percent of homes in the northeast use heating oil. Regions that heavily depend on home heating oil, such as, may I dare say, Massachusetts, they will pay an average bill of \$2,354 extra due to the draconian measures on energy, the reckless and radical policies of the left on energy production.

If we want to actually help these individuals, like Republicans want to do, we can pass H.R. 1. I also want to focus on the comment: Who do we trust? We heard that refrain over and over from my good friend from Massachusetts. I can tell you who we shouldn't trust. We shouldn't trust the so-called experts that the Democrats are infatuated with.

Let's talk about some of the statements we have heard, some of the predictions from these so-called experts. Al Gore in 2006 said: "If you look at the 10 hottest years ever measured . . . they have all occurred in the last 14 years. The hottest of all was in 2005."

"Within the decade there will be no more snows of Kilimanjaro."

He said that in 2006. Last time I checked, it was 2023 and we still had snow on Mt. Kilimanjaro.

Al Gore also said:

The North Pole will be ice-free in the summer by 2013 because of manmade global warming.

That was 2013. It is 2023. Another prediction that has not come true.

John Kerry, the climate czar, in 2009 said:

You have sea ice, which is melting at a rate that the Arctic Ocean is now increasingly exposed to. In 5 years, scientists predict we will have the first ice-free Arctic summer. . . .

That was 2009. It is 2023. Last time I checked, there was still ice in the Arctic.

Let's talk about Barack Obama and his predictions. In 2015, he said:

No challenge poses a greater threat to the future generations than climate change.

When he left office, let's not forget that this man bought beachfront property in Martha's Vineyard, while having the audacity to tell us that we are facing rising sea levels due to climate change. Again, he bought a beachside mansion in Martha's Vineyard, so spare me.

In talking about the greatest threat, notice there was no mention of the CCP, notice there was no mention of Russia, which in debate with Republicans—when Republicans were pointing to the threat posed by Russia, Barack Obama said the 1980s want their foreign policy back.

Let's talk about another so-called expert that the left loves to talk about, Greta Thunberg. In 2018, she tweeted: "A top climate scientist is warning that climate change will wipe out all of humanity unless we stop using fossil fuels over the next 5 years."

Conveniently, Greta Thunberg deleted that tweet this month. Why? Because that was said in 2018. It is now 2023, 5 years later, and humanity is still around.

It is easy to say that the experts have just been wrong in the last few years, since the early 2000s. The so-called experts have been wrong on this topic since the 1960s.

In 1969, The New York Times published a piece from Paul Ehrlich, and he said—the so-called expert, by the way: "We must realize that unless we are extremely lucky, everybody will disappear in a cloud of blue steam in 20 years." Again, that was 1969. That didn't happen. Yet, in 2023, Paul Ehrlich—I think he is 90 years old—this man is still being published and still being held up as an expert on climate change, and appearing on 60 Minutes telling us that we are all going to die. Spare me.

I have got more quotes. I could go on, but it is very clear who you should trust. The Republicans are the party of science. The Democrats are the party of political science. The Republicans are the party of chemistry. The Democrats are the party of alchemy. We are the party of astronomy. They are the party of astrology. The science is with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my good friend and fellow Rules Committee member.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania. I couldn't help but notice my colleagues on the

other side of the aisle going, yet again, to one of their pages in their playbook that they love to bring out every single time we have a debate—oh, who can you trust?

You can't trust corporate America. Guess what? I don't trust corporate America. I don't trust Big Oil. I don't. I don't trust them any more than I trust any of the big government bureaucrats that decide what is best for me. I do trust the market.

I do trust people being able to go out and use their capital to go out and produce the best energy for the American people. This administration and my Democratic colleagues don't want to do that, as exemplified by the fact that the President of the United States dumped 300 million barrels out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve last year heading into an election.

Mr. Speaker, 300 million barrels. They cut the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in half in order to bail out their election because their policies were so bad. Even Goldman Sachs is saying that the so-called Inflation Reduction Act, which massively expands unreliable energy, would cost \$1.2 trillion. That is the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for this bill. I think it is critically important that we take a massive step forward to try to ensure that we open up exploration on lands, repeal the methane tax, and overall permitting.

It is only a simple step because the step that has to be taken is to free up the market from the ungodly amount of subsidies coming from Washington, subsidizing unreliable energy at the expense of capital being able to flow into the development of oil and natural gas and nuclear power to ensure that we have the power to live our lives.

When you have a cloudy, windless day, you have to have power. This building is powered by natural gas. Hospitals across the country stay open because of natural gas. The fact of the matter is, you cannot power the world right now with wind and solar power.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle live in unicorn land with fairy dust, completely ignoring the reality of what happens to real Americans when the cost of their goods and services go up; when they have inflation skyrocketing and raising up; when it is destroying their way of life because people want to feel good about themselves hopping in their Tesla and rolling around pretending there is a magic energy tree. There isn't.

People's lives are at stake. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want the American people to lack the energy that they need to live their lives productively and affordably. You want to know why inflation is going up?

Because this body has spent money it doesn't have. The Fed has printed money and jacked up the extent to which we have massive easy money out in the supply money. We have spent money we don't have. We have regulated the oil and gas industry to death,

such that we don't have the ability to actually back up their magic fairy dust energy supplies with wind and solar.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says that this building is powered by natural gas. I think it is probably more accurate to say it is powered by hot air.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that this bill is a giveaway to the oil companies. The gentleman says he doesn't trust Big Oil, but this is a bill that gives them everything they want—their wish list.

Trust the markets? I don't know that the market can clean up a toxic waste dump or the market can clean up an oil spill or the market can monitor clean air.

□ 1245

The bottom line is this bill goes after all of those protections and actually endangers the American people.

To the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who I hope will read more quotes because I think it is making it clear—which is shocking in the year 2023—he is making the case that climate change doesn't exist going all the way back to Al Gore, who actually was right when he said that climate change was a problem, and selectively taking these quotes from way back when.

Does anybody believe that climate change isn't real?

Come to Massachusetts. I will introduce you to my farmers who complain about the impacts of climate change on their ability to make a livelihood. Maple syrup producers wonder whether they will be able to get maple syrup out of trees in Massachusetts because of climate change. I could go on and on about the impacts of climate change on our local farmers.

Much of this discussion, Mr. Speaker, can be tied back to Republicans' affinity for culture wars. They just claimed a little while ago that President Biden and Democrats were planning to come after Americans' gas stoves. It couldn't be further from the truth. No one is taking your stove.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a Vox article titled: "Five myths about gas stoves, the latest culture war clash."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[From Vox, Jan. 20, 2023]

5 MYTHS ABOUT GAS STOVES, THE LATEST CULTURE WAR CLASH

(By Rebecca Leber)

The debate over the future of the gas stove has been going on for years, long before last week, when it turned into a full-fledged culture war.

Public health officials, researchers, and doctors have long been taking note of the abundant research linking pollution from the gas stove to respiratory problems, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission announced in December it was taking a look at the health risks to determine what regulations would be appropriate for the gas stove.

But after a member of the CPSC told Bloomberg in an interview last week that "products that can't be made safe can be banned," the fervor built quickly. Republicans (and some Democrats) portrayed the commissioner's remark as a sign that the Biden administration was coming for the gas stove as its next attack on American freedom. And plenty of defenders of the gas stove came out insisting it's the superior way to cook.

The fracas generated some new myths about gas stove regulation—and perpetuated other long-held misunderstandings. Here's how to separate fact from fiction.

MYTH 1: BIDEN—OR FEDERAL REGULATORS—WANT TO TAKE YOUR GAS STOVE AWAY

The hysteria that ensued when the Consumer Product Safety Commission said it would be taking a closer look at gas stoves could be summed up by a tweet from Rep. Ronny Jackson (R-TX). "I'll never give up my gas stove. If the maniacs in the White House come for my stove, they can pry it from my cold dead hands. Come and take it!"

Some confusion comes from remarks from CPSC Commissioner Richard Trumka Jr., who told Bloomberg that "any option" is on the table as the independent agency considers the hazards posed by the gas stove: "Products that can't be made safe can be banned," he said. The CPSC later clarified those remarks: The commission said that there is no ban under consideration, and "the CPSC is looking for ways to reduce related indoor air quality hazards."

There are a lot of other options, like requiring range hood ventilation to be sold alongside the gas stove and warning labels, that the commission could consider before an outright ban. And any CPSC regulation for stoves would apply to new products being sold, not those already in people's homes.

What's more, it's not the White House that's calling all the shots here. The CPSC commissioners are appointed by the president, but otherwise, its regulations are not vetted through the White House, unlike the Environmental Protection Agency's process. States and cities are also already taking action to minimize the climate and health risks involved with combusting gas indoors.

The White House has said it doesn't support a ban, but it is promoting incentives through the Inflation Reduction Act that help people voluntarily electrify their homes.

MYTH 2: GAS STOVE HAZARDS ARE "NEWFOUND"

In a letter to the CPSC's Trumka, Sen. J.D. Vance (R-OH) calls the gas stove a "newfound 'hidden hazard' that rests on limited research." In another section, Vance says there's a "lack of compelling evidence."

The study that caught national attention estimated that almost 13 percent of childhood asthma cases in the U.S. are linked to gas stove use, similar to the level caused by secondhand smoke. That study is based on a review of the evidence from 2013, which examined 41 studies from multiple countries, dating as far back as 1977, to conclude that children living in households with gas stoves had a 42 percent higher risk of currently being diagnosed with asthma and a 24 percent higher risk of being diagnosed with asthma at some point in their life.

"Although the effects of gas cooking and indoor NO₂ on asthma and wheeze were found to be relatively small . . . the public health impact may still be considerable because gas cooking is widespread," the authors of the 2013 evidence review concluded.

These studies looked at the impact of gas cooking specifically. But there's an even longer trail of studies looking at the pollutant nitrogen dioxide, which is emitted by gas

stoves, and the damage it does to people exposed to it outdoors. In fact, outdoor NO₂ pollution is regulated by the EPA, which has done its own thorough reviews of NO₂ risks.

MYTH 3: NO TYPE OF COOKING CAN COMPARE TO THE GAS STOVE

The idea that gas is vastly superior to all its alternatives is pervasive and is eagerly pushed by both appliance makers and the natural gas industry. Whirlpool, which manufactures both gas and electric, says matter-of-factly on its website, "If you like to make meals that require rapid temperature changes, gas ranges might be the way to go."

The comparisons between gas and electric are usually comparing apples and oranges: the contemporary gas stove against dated electric stoves. The better modern equivalent is induction, which uses electromagnetic energy that makes the pans themselves a heat source, leaving the actual stovetop relatively cool. These new models come with settings that allow you to cook precisely at a certain temperature and hold that heat, with a lower risk of burns. Other positive reviews note that induction stoves are easier to clean and can boil water faster than gas stoves.

Chefs are also more split on induction versus gas than the public realizes. In a Vox interview, Jon Kung, a Detroit-based chef, noted that he prefers induction because it improves his indoor air quality and heat in the home. He also noted you can use woks with it, a common complaint about switching away from gas. Sierra magazine has talked to other chefs who prefer induction. "For me, it was an economic no-brainer," chef Michael Godlewski said on opening an all-induction restaurant in Pittsburgh in spring 2022 called EYV (Eat Your Veggies). "They asked me where I wanted the gas line, and I said, 'Nowhere.'"

An induction range is expensive; it can run you in the thousands of dollars. But the cost is coming down. One program some households may qualify for is the Inflation Reduction Act's kitchen appliance tax credits and rebates. The 25C tax credits cover a range of energy-efficient products in the home, including an induction range. It allows you to deduct 30 percent of the costs of electrical work on the house (up to \$1,200). Later this year, there will be rebates available, too, under the High-Efficiency Electric Home Rebate Program. Households making up to 150 percent of the local median income will lower the upfront costs of the appliance and installation. Lower-income households (below 80 percent of the median income) can have all their costs covered under the program.

In the meantime, households that don't want to wait or don't qualify could also opt for a portable plug-in induction stovetop, which costs much less and is renter-friendly.

MYTH 4: MOST OF AMERICA USES GAS STOVES

Gas stoves are common but not ubiquitous. Per the Energy Information Administration, on average, 38 percent of the country uses gas for cooking, or about 40 million stoves. But those numbers vary widely depending on where you are. New York, New Jersey, Illinois, and California have the highest rates of gas stoves in the country, over 60 percent. Southeastern states have some of the lowest rates in the country, under 20 percent.

Sen. Joe Manchin (D-WV) reacted to the CPSC uproar by tweeting, "I can tell you the last thing that would ever leave my house is the gas stove that we cook on."

Manchin himself may have a gas stove, but many in his state do not. In fact, a survey from the EIA in 2020 found that a quarter of West Virginia residents have a gas cooking appliance, while 73 percent use electric.

The consequences of gas appliances aren't also evenly distributed. Children, who have

smaller lungs, are at higher risk of developing complications from NO₂, and so are older adults and people with preexisting health conditions. Another risk factor is if a person is already exposed to other pollution sources in addition to the stove. They might live near a highway, an industrial site, or even in an area with concentrated gas appliances all venting outside, so they are breathing dirty air both outside and indoors.

MYTH 5: AS LONG AS YOU USE VENTILATION, THE RISKS DON'T MATTER

The American Gas Association's website emphasizes that with ventilation like a working range hood, the gas stove is not a problem for indoor air quality. The Wall Street Journal editorial board echoed this: "Studies flogged by the climate left don't account for the effects of ventilation. One even sealed a test kitchen in plastic tarps in an effort to show that gas stoves increase pollution."

More recent research from LBNL found that a gas stove can also be leaking methane, a greenhouse gas, even when the appliance is shut off. Inside the home, the level of methane is probably low enough that the researchers don't consider these leaks to be a health threat. But methane is also a larger problem, not just for its climate risks but because it contributes to ground-level ozone that harms human health.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, our neighbors back home send us here to Washington to stand up for them and to stand up to the powerful special interests that have all too much influence here in the halls of Washington. They expect us to work to lower costs and for good-paying jobs and safe and healthy communities.

That is why this Republican polluters over people act is so dangerous. It does the opposite of what we should be doing here. This bill would reward the price gouging of the big oil and gas companies. This bill would roll back our bedrock environmental protections for clean air, clean water, and lower-cost clean energy.

Mr. MCGOVERN, I think it is important that you know that in the Energy and Commerce Committee last week, at the very last minute, with no hearing and very little debate, they included a provision that would roll back an important piece of the Inflation Reduction Act that puts money back into people's pockets back home for energy efficiency rebates and discounts to help lower energy bills. They do this at a time when Exxon made record profits last year, \$56 billion, and Chevron \$36 billion.

Fossil fuels were the main driver of inflation, yet you want to give another massive giveaway to oil and gas companies and take away simple energy rebates for homeowners?

They are doing it at a time when it looks as if this bill would increase the deficit by half a billion dollars. This is an irresponsible giveaway to polluters at the expense of our neighbors back home. It deserves a big "no" vote.

Let's think about the people we represent for a change.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RESCIENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, spare me the gaslighting on gas stoves. We know that, just yesterday, New York banned all gas stoves in new buildings. We are talking about New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY), who is my good friend on the Rules Committee.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, which provides consideration of legislation to bring relief to Americans and unleash the power of American energy.

Forty percent—that is the spike in heating costs borne by many of my constituents in New York State during a bitter, life-threatening winter. For a family on a budget and a retiree on a fixed income, that 40 percent hike is a painful one. It means doing without certain items from the grocery store or carefully rationing when and how you keep the heat on in your home despite bitterly cold temperatures.

Mr. Speaker, these are the terrible choices that my constituents must make due to the Biden-Hochul energy agenda. This is life for many Americans in the unaffordable, inflation-ridden Biden economy.

Let's not be fooled by the President's rhetoric about a Putin price hike at the pump. The regulatory machine imposed on American energy has been built for one objective in mind: to destroy our Nation's energy sector as we know it.

In New York State, our Governor, Kathy Hochul, has made it a top priority to force our State's farmers, the guarantors of our Nation's food security and leaders in conservation, into a future of expensive and unreliable electric vehicles and equipment.

That technology doesn't even exist yet. We know that current EV technology is inferior to diesel machinery. We know that a future with more EV batteries and EV motors means greater dependence on China. God forbid we let those inconvenient truths get in the way of the left's radical and out-of-touch Green New Deal religion.

The southern tier of New York sits atop one of our country's greatest natural resource endowments, the Marcellus shale. Just across the border from my district in neighboring Pennsylvania, hydraulic fracturing has created an economic miracle and newfound prosperity. It has transformed their economy while counties in my district in the southern tier are some of the poorest in our State.

Yet Governor Hochul, who is taking her cues from Democrats here in Washington, has made it her mission to ensure those same opportunities, that dream of prosperity and economic revival, are denied to New Yorkers in the southern tier.

Democrats in Albany and Washington have locked away the promise of natural gas production. They have blocked the construction of oil and gas pipelines. They are now leading the way in banning natural gas to our homes.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are desperate for relief and an end to the left's destructive anti-energy agenda. H.R. 1 promises to unleash the power of our Nation's energy sector once again. It will create countless new jobs and bring investment and economic rebirth into communities across this great country. It will allow Americans once again to live in a world where they can afford to farm their farms, drive their cars, put food on their tables, and heat their homes. I support this rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the way everybody is yelling and screaming over there, you would think that they want to have a debate on ideas, but this rule actually blocks over three-quarters of all the amendments submitted.

Democrats offered 95 amendments. Mr. Speaker, do you know how many they made in order? Seven.

That is not just an interesting statistic, Mr. Speaker. It means that real and important ideas are completely blocked from even being debated on this House floor on their signature piece of legislation. Many of these amendments would protect public health and safety and our environment.

Take, for example, an amendment by Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, No. 37, that requires permits prepared under the NEPA process to include an analysis of health and safety impacts. That is it. It seems like a good idea to me.

The amendment sponsored by Mrs. SYKES, No. 118, takes into account drinking water quality when approving permits. I don't think clean drinking water ought to be a radical idea, but maybe it is on the Republican side of the aisle. We should debate it.

Another amendment submitted by Mrs. DINGELL, No. 15, would require the United States to actually reduce its emissions before repealing a section of the law, the greenhouse gas reduction fund, set up to spur clean energy projects and reduce air pollution.

I offered three amendments, and they were all blocked. One of them, No. 94, struck language in this bill providing blanket immunity to polluters who violate our country's bedrock environmental laws.

Really? Do you think that is objectionable? We can't even debate it here? We can do 7 hours of general debate, but we can't take 10 minutes to discuss whether companies should get a blank check to pollute. Whose side are you on?

Back in January, Speaker MCCARTHY actually promised both sides "more openness, more opportunity for ideas to win at the end of the day." Mr. Speaker, that promise has been broken. This Republican majority knows their

bills fail to address real problems, so they continue to block our good ideas from even coming to the floor rather than debating them. They are scared to let Americans hear our ideas, and that tells you everything you need to know.

This is important, I think, for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to know. My friends across the aisle blocked all six amendments from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the co-chair of the Problem Solvers Caucus, Mr. FITZPATRICK, who happens to be a Republican. They blocked all six.

Mr. FITZPATRICK's amendments would have opposed drilling in the Delaware River Basin, ensured the act doesn't preempt a State constitution, established an infrastructure and environmental innovation trust fund, preserved the greenhouse gas reduction fund, prohibited energy exploration activities on any protected public land, and added a sense of Congress that U.S. citizens have a right to clean air and clean water.

I get it. My friends are pushing this polluters over people bill, but our colleague, a Republican who is the co-chair of the Problem Solvers Caucus, was denied all six of these amendments.

What are you afraid of? Why don't you debate these?

It is unfortunate that those ideas apparently were just too radical to even be debated on the House floor.

I truly hope that Mr. FITZPATRICK, after witnessing his own majority block all of his amendments, even the ones the gentleman watered down with a revision, I hope he will not support this rule. Supporting this rule would mean the gentleman would be voting to block his own amendments.

In fact, I ask all Republican members of the Problem Solvers Caucus to vote "no" on this rule because if you don't, this will be the pattern.

Mr. Speaker, I rhetorically ask the Problem Solvers Caucus how they plan to solve any problems if their Republican leadership won't even let them offer their ideas and won't even give them a fair fight on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, spare me the pearl-clutching about this amendment process. Let me remind my friends across the aisle that last Congress, their H.R. 1 was a closed rule. Zero amendments from either side were allowed.

We have Democrat and Republican amendments on this bill, so, again, spare me. Also, spare me that we don't want to debate this. Spare me that we don't want to have this debated and other viewpoints heard.

White House climate adviser Gina McCarthy recently called for Big Tech censorship of Americans who dared to speak out against the Biden administration's radical, far-left Green New

Deal agenda. I think it is very clear who wants censorship. I think it is very clear who is afraid of ideas that don't fit their narrative. It is the Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD), who is my good friend.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1.

From day one, this administration has demonized American energy producers, forcing prices to skyrocket and compromising our national security.

My Missouri constituents care about three things, Mr. Speaker: food, fuel, and fertilizer. This President has done nothing but raise prices on all three.

Our constituents don't want to be forced to drive a Prius. They want affordable prices at the pump. The F-150 is the model of a truck made in Missouri. It shouldn't be what it costs to fill it up, but that is exactly how much it cost this past summer. It has to end.

Since taking office, President Biden has canceled construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, which could have supplied us with more than 800,000 barrels of oil a day. He has depleted our strategic reserves to their lowest levels since 1983. The cherry on the top, Mr. Speaker, is that he has prevented any new permits on Federal lands and completely undermined the permitting process.

This President has kneecapped American energy producers.

America should not have to choose between driving to work and putting food on the table, but that is exactly what is happening in America today. This administration is making them make those tough choices, and that is exactly why we need H.R. 1.

We promised the American people that we would make sure they could fill up their trucks. We promised that we would fight to make it affordable to heat their homes. We promised to fight the woke Green New Deal policies that are killing our energy sector.

This legislation does just that. It will increase domestic energy production. It will reform the permitting process for all industries. It will reverse the anti-energy policies being perpetrated by the Biden administration.

Mr. Speaker, it is not complicated. We know that American energy producers make the cleanest energy in the world. Let's not only make America energy independent; let's make America energy dominant.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rules package on this critical piece of legislation and "yes" on H.R. 1.

Let's put a tiger back in the tank and not a kitty cat in the glorified golf cart.

□ 1300

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania just said that when we introduced H.R. 1, our H.R. 1 was a closed rule. I would urge him to go back and look at the statistics because our H.R. 1 in the 117th Congress had a structured rule with 56 amendments in order, more than the 36 on this bill. In the previous Congress, our H.R. 1 had even more amendments in order.

If the gentleman can't even be kind of factual about that, what else should we wonder whether it is based on fact or not?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, Democrats believe in putting people over politics. Last Congress, Democrats tackled climate change and brought down energy costs for the American people. Those investments in the Inflation Reduction Act have already spurred investments in clean energy projects and created good-paying jobs. At a time when we see rising costs, the Inflation Reduction Act will save the average American family \$1,800 a year.

The Biden administration is also moving forward with an important rule to limit methane emissions nationwide. New Mexico led the way on this. We strengthened our methane emissions rules in 2021.

The Energy Information Administration data shows that even though we strengthened our methane emissions, we grew year after year for 5 years in natural gas and energy production. The Land of Enchantment shows us that we don't have to sacrifice the environment for energy production.

H.R. 1 would sacrifice the environment and put polluters over people. Members of the majority are pursuing this at a time when CEOs for large corporations have made record profits. While the industry made \$451 billion in profits just last year, New Mexicans and people throughout rural America were taking groceries out of their carts to pay for gas.

H.R. 1 will not make it cheaper for the ranchers I know in Colfax County to fill up their trucks. Republicans dispute this and say the bill will lower costs. Let's see.

I offered an amendment to see if that is true. My amendment simply states that H.R. 1 does not take effect until the Secretaries of Energy and of the Interior certify that it will lower costs for American taxpayers and consumers.

What did the Republicans do with this commonsense amendment? They voted it down unanimously.

What are they afraid of seeing?

What are they afraid of debating?

The reality is H.R. 1 guts our long-standing environmental safeguards. It makes it easier to dump toxic and hazardous wastes. It threatens clean drinking water and lines the pockets of the wealthiest CEOs.

The Clean Water Act has long been key to protecting America's water. As

we say, “agua es vida”, “water is life.” This bill guts our Clean Water Act in favor of polluters.

The Republicans also rejected my amendment to protect our water from mining for our farmers, ranchers, and Tribes. We have to remember that the mining that is proposed that would decimate our waters is often proposed by Chinese-owned subsidiaries or foreign-owned subsidiaries.

The Republicans also blocked an amendment that would have required that Chinese subsidiaries not own our minerals.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I admit I misspoke, it wasn't H.R. 1 in the 117th. It was—wait for it—H.R. 5, the Equality Act; H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act; and H.R. 4, the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act. Three of the low-numbered bills that my friends across the aisle ran last Congress, their so-called priority bills, were run with closed rules. Just to be clear on that, it wasn't H.R. 1, but it was the three other ones that they ran as a priority.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for admitting his error and admitting that he was wrong when he said H.R. 1 was a closed rule we brought up. I think perhaps the gentleman might want to go back and consult some of his research because I think he would also find out that some of the things he said about climate change would be proven factually wrong.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, as I said last night before the Rules Committee, I don't disagree with this legislation. Every day I hear from my constituents, gasoline prices are way too high. They have got to choose between paying for groceries and filling up their gas tank. I agree, we should ease the burden on American taxpayers. However, I disagree that this is the right way to do it.

Just last year, the Inflation Reduction Act made historic investments in home energy rebates, tax credits, clean energy vehicles, land and water conservation, and grants for greenhouse gas reduction.

This legislation, in contrast, does not make any new investments. It simply walks back all the progress we have made before we can see the results of those investments.

That is why I introduced last night an amendment to simply say that any future investments in gas and oil be equaled in clean energy investments.

Why? Because we want to make sure we keep America on the world stage as leaders in energy production.

Sadly, my colleagues across the aisle will not be bringing up my amendment for a vote this week.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time until closing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I didn't prepare a speech today. I brought the bill to the floor because I have great empathy for my colleague on the other side of the aisle who has the unenviable task of somehow trying to defend this 200-page bill, the polluters over people act. These 200 pages put polluters first at every turn.

Mr. Speaker, if you don't believe me, I encourage you to read the bill. Buried in this 200-page bill, on page 40, is a provision that gives the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator of the EPA the power to grant a waiver to any refinery in this country from the key requirements of bedrock environmental laws that have governed this space for the better part of the last 50 years, since the days of President Richard Nixon.

Look at subparagraph (c) that enables any party who acts under a waiver granted under this bill to violate any environmental law and have blanket immunity. The Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, NEPA, you name it, they will waive it. That is not a bill that puts people first. It is a bill that puts polluters first. It is why I am proud to vote “no” and why I encourage every Member of this distinguished body to vote “no” on this bill.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time until my closing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from nearly 100 energy and environment groups including the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, The Wilderness Society, and Oceana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MARCH 27, 2023.

Re Vote Recommendation on H.R. 1, the “Lower Energy Costs Act”

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters, the undersigned organizations write to express our strong opposition and to urge you to vote NO on H.R. 1, the so-called “Lower Energy Costs Act,” which the House will take up this week.

This legislation would exacerbate the climate crisis, perpetuate environmental injustices, and undermine U.S. economic and national security by prolonging reliance on risky and volatile energy sources. Its sweeping changes to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Mineral Leasing Act, the Mining Law of 1872, and the Clean Water Act prioritize polluter profits over public health and exhibit an astonishing disregard for government accountability and the voices and welfare of communities impacted by federal decisions.

DIVISION A

Division A would encourage new fossil fuel production and infrastructure, despite the scientific consensus that there is no room for

investment in new fossil fuel production if we are to keep the world on a 1.5 °C compatible pathway. It would also undermine bedrock environmental laws, including NEPA, by short-circuiting permitting processes and limiting public input. NEPA is a critical environmental law and an important tool for frontline and environmental justice communities to influence federal infrastructure projects that will impact them the most.

Division A's most egregious provisions:

Repeal the Methane Emissions Reduction Program created by the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA). This critical program supports efforts to reduce methane emissions from the oil and gas sector, improve methane monitoring, fund environmental restoration, and help communities reduce the health impacts of pollution.

Undercut public transparency and input from communities by arbitrarily limiting the time for environmental reviews. The bill alters the approval process for gas pipelines by requiring all other federal and state agencies to defer to FERC.

Strip away the federal government's responsibility to examine the full impacts of LNG expansion on US energy markets, the environment, and local communities. It would make it easier to approve LNG exports by removing the first three sections of the Natural Gas Act, which require a public interest determination for LNG exports to non-FTA countries and by mandating that FERC deem gas exports in the public interest. LNG exports negatively impact Americans by exacerbating climate change, raising domestic energy prices, and perpetuating environmental injustices, and these factors need to be taken into account when deciding whether to approve additional LNG export terminals.

Authorize the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to waive the Clean Air Act (CAA) and Solid Waste Disposal Act (SWDA) requirements for waste produced by certain energy facilities. Exempting energy waste potentially including everything from fracking wastewater to mine processing facilities and tailing sites to nuclear facilities from these laws threatens the health of people in frontline communities, as well as our air and water. The waste from energy production are some of the most threatening products and sites, and often they exist for hundreds of years, even in perpetuity, which is part of the reason why the Superfund program is overwhelmed.

Undermine the Toxic Substances Control Act by short circuiting the review and approval process for new chemicals used in the energy sector, whether that is for fracking, petrochemicals, mining or dozens of other products. This rushed and weak assessment, which would lead to default approvals, would result in the blind rubber-stamping of chemicals for use in energy that have deleterious impacts on human health and the environment. Virtually any chemical that plays a role in the production, refining, distribution, and use of energy could be designated as “critical” by the Department of Energy.

Allow the EPA Administrator to circumvent the scientific process of approving or denying flexible air permitting at the agency. Doing so could potentially allow the EPA Administrator to increase air pollution from so-called “critical energy resource facilities,” subsequently harming environmental and public health. A broad spectrum of facilities that emit toxic air pollution could evade scrutiny for health impacts, including processing and refining products of oil, gas, coal, minerals, and fertilizers.

Modify the organization of the Department of Energy, taking the authority on many issues and processes that are vital for the protection of communities, air, lands, and

water away from those who have the expertise in understanding the potential impacts of extraction and production, whether that is the Department of Interior (DOI) or Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). In doing so it makes the only metric for consideration economic, which would mean that communities, lands, and waters would be sacrificed.

This Division also contains a provision purporting to support domestic supplies of “critical minerals,” but in reality creates a new legislated term—“critical energy resources”—which the majority has defined to mean virtually anything related to the energy sector, whether that is oil and gas, coal, petrochemicals or nuclear production, mineral processing, and refining.

Other notably problematic provisions in the remainder of Division A would:

Prohibit the President from issuing a moratorium on fracking unless authorized by Congress. Fracking releases massive amounts of methane, a potent greenhouse gas that has more than 80 times the power of carbon dioxide over a 20-year period, driving approximately one quarter of the warming our planet has experienced to date. Fracking also harms local communities and ecosystems by releasing air pollutants and contaminating water sources.

Exempt certain energy facilities from requirements to secure an interim permit before operating, instead allowing the facilities to operate before securing such a permit. The result could be the release of harmful pollutants into our air and water, threatening the environment and health of people in frontline communities. The facilities that could receive a permit without an accurate assessment of their impact include everything from radioactive waste to petrochemicals to fertilizer to mining waste, all extremely toxic industries.

Express disapproval of President Biden revoking the Presidential Permit for Keystone XL pipeline. If built, Keystone XL would have carried 830,000 barrels per day of the dirtiest oil on the planet, threatening our climate, farmland, critical water resources, and wildlife habitat along the pipeline's path.

Express the sense of Congress that the federal government should not restrict the export of crude oil or other petroleum products. Increased oil drilling and exports have enormous climate repercussions and pollute communities and ecosystems. They also open U.S. consumers to the whipsaw effects of geopolitical tensions and conflicts, creating energy instability and often driving significant increases in energy prices. The federal government must ensure that these exports do not compromise US climate and environmental justice goals or undermine our global climate leadership.

DIVISION B

Title I would take us in the wrong direction on onshore and offshore oil and gas leasing. It would lock in decades' worth of fossil fuel infrastructure, preclude protections for millions more acres of public lands, split estates, and offshore waters, and handcuff the Biden Administration's ability to address the climate crisis through thoughtful management of our shared public resources. Like many recent proposals from the present House majority, it attempts to further prop up the federal fossil fuel program despite rising (and record) production, and industry's existing access to tens of millions of acres of our shared public spaces and thousands of approved and unused permits to drill on federal lands and in offshore waters.

To start, Title I:

Mandates leasing onshore and offshore, eviscerating long-standing precedent that defers leasing decisions to the President and the Secretary of the Interior.

Rushes oil and gas drilling permits through the environmental review process with zero regard for community input, effects on endangered species, or emissions consequences.

Exempts as many permitting decisions from the federal review process as possible.

Severely restricts the President's authority to protect specific lands with natural, cultural, or scientific significance.

Repeals the hard-fought common-sense reforms to the outdated oil and gas leasing program that were enacted in the Inflation Reduction Act to ensure that industry pays a fairer share when reaping—and profiting from—shared, public resources. Title II, which incorporates the BUILDER Act, would eviscerate NEPA and fundamentally gut the review of environmental, health, and economic impacts of decisions by over 80 agencies in the federal government. If passed, local community voices would be silenced, the public would be essentially unable to hold the federal government accountable, and polluting industries would be allowed to steer a review process designed to be in the public, not private, interest. The ways this bill would radically undermine informed government decision-making and accountability are too numerous to detail here, but a few merit particular attention:

Dramatically Narrows Application of NEPA and Limits the Scope of Reviews—The bill would radically limit the application of NEPA by redefining the threshold consideration of what is a “major federal action” for the purposes of NEPA. Further, the bill excludes oil and gas gathering lines, federal loans, projects not occurring on federal lands, loan guarantees, and other forms of financial assistance from NEPA, which could potentially allow projects such as offshore oil and gas development, coal fired generating facilities, LNG projects, nuclear facilities, roads, bridges, highways, and concentrated animal feeding operations to evade any review or public scrutiny. For reviews that do occur, it relieves agencies of any responsibility to undertake any new research necessary for informed decision making and potentially prevents the consideration of upstream and downstream impacts of decisions, thus codifying climate denial into federal decisions.

Essentially Eliminates Judicial Review—In addition to reducing the statute of limitations to a mere 120 days, the bill would bar legal challenges to categorical exclusions as well as many environmental assessments. For the few remaining projects subject to judicial review, injunctive relief would be prohibited, thus ensuring that projects move forward regardless of how egregiously deficient a review or harmful the impacts of a project on a community or the environment.

Allows Inherent Conflicts of Interests In Review—The bill would allow project sponsors to prepare their own environmental reviews, thus eliminating objective analyses about the environmental and related social and economic effects of federal actions and institutionalizing bias in the review process. This potentially undermines the entire purpose of NEPA to have federal agencies make informed, unbiased decisions in the public interest.

Prioritizes Project Sponsors Over the Public Interest—The legislation not only would impose arbitrary timelines on reviews but would also prohibit an agency from extending the time if needed to do essential scientific work or to accommodate public comment, unless the project sponsor agrees. Further, the bill would severely narrow what has long been considered the “heart” of the NEPA process, by prioritizing consideration of alternatives that meet the project sponsor goals.

Finally, Title II would exacerbate deficiencies in the existing 151-year-old mining law, result in an unnecessary increase in mining on federal public lands, and put at risk irreplaceable protected lands, special places, endangered and sensitive wildlife, tribal sacred sites, and culturally significant sites. Current mining law has allowed for the pollution of America's environment and waterways, placing additional unjust burdens on communities who have already borne the brunt of our nation's toxic mining legacy. The GAO estimates America is littered with hundreds of thousands of abandoned mines while the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) estimates hardrock mines have polluted 40 percent of the headwaters of western U.S. watersheds and will cost taxpayers more than \$50 billion to clean up. Under current law, taxpayers are potentially liable for billions more in cleanup costs at currently operating mines because the legal requirements for mining companies to remediate lands and waters remain inadequate. This legislation does nothing to address the legacy of abandoned mines or promote remediation of American lands and waters.

Of particular concern, this Title upends more than a century of practice by validating mining claims under the Mining Law of 1872 before the claimant has proven a mineral discovery. Currently, mining claims do not become valid just because the claimant says so: mining rights fully vest only after the miner discovers valuable minerals. Yet, under Section 20307, a claimant would no longer need to actually prove they discovered valuable minerals. Instead, any person could “claim” mining rights on unwithdrawn public lands merely by grounding a stake, paying a fee, and filing some paperwork. This Section would effectively lock out most other uses of public lands, prioritizing mining instead regardless of whether those lands had any value for mineral development.

Title II also continues the current majority's constant attempts to unnecessarily prop up the domestic uranium industry. Under Section 20308, the U.S. Geological Survey is once again directed to reevaluate its list of critical minerals. However, under this bill, “fuel minerals” are now defined to specifically exclude uranium, making it an automatic candidate for consideration despite its dominant use as a fuel mineral.

DIVISION C

Division C (as well as Section 10008(e) of Division A) would weaken state and tribal authority under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, one of the law's most important provisions empowering states. Native, rural, and socioeconomically disadvantaged communities have been fighting to stem the marginalization accompanying resource extraction for decades and Section 401 enables those communities to work through states and tribes to protect their waters.

States and authorized tribes depend on the Clean Water Act Section 401 certification process to ensure that projects requiring federal licenses and permits will not harm the waters within their borders—projects like dams, river alterations, wetland fills, and interstate pipelines. If this bill is enacted, state and tribal experts would lose a key oversight tool for activities that can threaten state and tribal investments in pollution control programs, fish recovery programs, temperature control mechanisms, minimum-flow requirements, and other essential activities.

The bill seeks to limit states' longstanding authority under Section 401 to broadly consider the impact of a project or activity on water quality. It would significantly curb Section 401's express authority enabling states to make certification decisions based

on requirements of state law, which would severely hamstring states' and tribes' ability to comply with laws they have adopted to maintain and improve the condition of their water bodies. As tribes often do not receive the required government-to-government consultation, they depend on Section 401 certification to ensure their waters remain protected. Rollbacks in this proposed legislation would severely restrict the usage of this tool, leaving tribes without one of the few tools they have to ensure their waters are healthy enough to support tribal rights and traditions.

CONCLUSION

H.R. 1 would encourage new fossil fuel production and infrastructure, locking us into increased extraction, high and volatile energy prices, and even greater profits for fossil fuel companies. It would undermine bedrock environmental laws through its short-circuiting of government accountability, meaningful public input, and review. It would put the interests of industry ahead of the public. We urge all Members to vote NO on H.R. 1, and to instead prioritize efforts to meet the challenge of the climate crisis, secure our clean energy future, and protect public health, community voices, public lands, waters, and oceans.

Sincerely,

350.org, Accountable.US, Alaska Clean Water Advocacy, Alaska Community Action on Toxics, Animal Welfare Institute, Azul, Bold Alliance, C.A.N. Coalition Against Nukes, Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Oil and Gas Organizing, Change the Chamber, Clean, Healthy, Educated, Safe & Sustainable Community, Inc., Climate Action Campaign, Climate Hawks Vote, Concerned Citizens of Cook County (Georgia), Conservation Colorado, Conservation Lands Foundation, Cook Inletkeeper, Dayenu: A Jewish Call to Climate Action, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Earthworks, Endangered Species Coalition, Environment America, Environmental Investigation Agency, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Environmental Protection Information Center—EPIC, Environmental Working Group, Fenceline Watch, For a Better Bayou, Friends of the Earth, Friends of the Kalmiopsis, Grand Canyon Trust, Green New Deal Network, GreenLatinos, Greenpeace, HG Conservation Solutions, Hip Hop Caucus, Hispanic Access Foundation, Honor the Earth, Humanity, Indigenous Environmental Network, Interfaith Power & Light, John Muir Project, Kalmiopsis Audubon Society, League of Conservation Voters, Los Padres ForestWatch, Lynn Canal Conservation, Malach Consulting, Micah Six Eighth Mission, Mining Impact Coalition of Wisconsin, Montana Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Defense Council, Nevada Wildlife Federation, NEW MEXICO SPORTSMEN, North American Climate, Conservation and Environment (NACCE), Northern Alaska Environmental Center, Nuclear Information and Resource Service, Oceana, Ocean Conservation Research, Ocean Defense Initiative, Operation HomeCare, Inc., Oregon Wild, Oxfam, PACAN, Project Eleven Hundred, Property Rights and Pipeline Center, Public Citizen, Public Citizen, Inc., Rachel Carson Council, Rio Grande Indivisible, NM, Rocky Mountain Wild, Safe Energy Rights Group, Save the Eau Claire River, Seven Circles Foundation, Sierra Club, Soda Mountain Wilderness Council, Southern Environmental Law Center, Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, Standing Trees, Stop The Oil Profiteering, Surfrider Foundation, Tapeats, The Wilderness Society, Trustees for Alaska, Tucson Audubon Society, Turtle Island Restoration Network, U.S. PIRG, Voices for Progress, Waterkeeper Alliance, WE ACT for

Environmental Justice, Western Environmental Law Center, Western Organization of Resource Councils, Western Watersheds Project, Winter Wildlands Alliance, Zero Hour

Please note that the organizations listed may not have positions on every topic included in this letter.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are saying that this bill doesn't put polluters over people. This letter I include states: "H.R. 1 would encourage new fossil fuel production and infrastructure, locking us into increased extraction, high and volatile energy prices, and even greater profits for fossil fuel companies. It would undermine bedrock environmental laws through a short-circuiting of government accountability, meaningful public input, and review. It would put the interests of industry ahead of the public."

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, H.R. 1 puts polluters over people. It does nothing to lower energy costs. Their bill makes it easier for companies to contaminate our water and spew pollution and God knows what else into the air. It will make us pay for corporations' messes while they leave behind a toxic trail of disaster.

The polluters over people act is a massive giveaway that ensures the GOP's industry friends make more money. I would say to those who are watching this, follow the money. Look at who the oil companies are giving their money to.

It jeopardizes American jobs. It worsens the climate crisis, and it takes monumental steps back from achieving a clean energy future.

Mr. Speaker, we can do so much better. This is such a blatant giveaway to polluters. This is such a blatant giveaway to big corporate interests. This is such a blatant giveaway to Big Oil. It is offensive.

I urge a strong "no" vote on this rule. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, my friend across the aisle wants to say follow the money so we can see where people's priorities are.

Let's just follow the Strategic Petroleum Reserve release. President Biden shipped 5 million barrels of this emergency fuel overseas to countries, including China. If you want to see where the priorities lie, don't follow the money, follow where the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is going, and that is going to China.

Also, quotes on climate change, I will provide my friend across the aisle with all my quotes regarding climate change. I have got pages and pages of them. What you might find very interesting are all the ones from the 1980s where the so-called experts were calling for the next ice age, so I would direct you to that just for the fun of it.

It is interesting to see how wrong these so-called experts are and somewhat ironic that we are still being told that the experts are right after literally decades of getting almost everything wrong.

The U.S. produces more oil and natural gas than any other country in the world. As a global energy power, we can provide lower energy prices, we can create steady jobs, and we can secure America and our allies with cheaper gas that is cleaner.

Just imagine if the U.S. were supplying LNG from the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to our allies in Europe. Think about that instead of our allies in Europe being dependent on Russian gas, which is 41 percent dirtier.

However, the left's goal is to eliminate fossil fuels. They want to make the United States dependent, unstable, poorer, needier, and weaker because they refuse to allow us to exploit our natural resources.

If you want to think about what lies ahead in the future if we allow the Democrats to get their energy plan in place, just look at Sri Lanka. I have already talked about it. Sri Lanka has a great ESG score. They also have an almost-failed state.

Don't think that this is just some misguided plan or misguided misinformation from the Democrats. This is their plan. They want to make hydrocarbons more expensive because their base, the liberal elites that sit at home on Zoom all day, they don't have to put gas in their tank, they work from home. It is the guys who are working, who shower after work that have to put gas in their trucks and cars. That is why it is necessary to pass H.R. 1.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question and "yes" on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 260

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 178) affirming the House of Representatives' commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 260; and

Adoption of House Resolution 260, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, LOWER ENERGY COSTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 260) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to lower energy costs by increasing American energy production, exports, infrastructure, and critical minerals processing, by promoting transparency, accountability, permitting, and production of American resources, and by improving water quality certification and energy projects, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 203, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—218

Aderholt	Armstrong	Baird
Alford	Arrington	Balderson
Allen	Babin	Banks
Amodei	Bacon	Barr

Bean (FL)	Gosar	Moolenaar
Bentz	Granger	Mooney
Bergman	Graves (LA)	Moore (AL)
Bice	Graves (MO)	Moore (UT)
Biggs	Green (TN)	Moran
Bilirakis	Greene (GA)	Murphy
Bishop (NC)	Griffith	Nehls
Boebert	Grothman	Newhouse
Bost	Guest	Norman
Brecheen	Guthrie	Nunn (IA)
Buchanan	Hageman	Obernolte
Buck	Harris	Ogles
Bucshon	Harshbarger	Owens
Burchett	Hern	Palmer
Burgess	Higgins (LA)	Pence
Burlison	Hill	Perry
Calvert	Hinson	Pfluger
Cammack	Houchin	Posey
Carey	Hudson	Reschenthaler
Carl	Huizenga	Rodgers (WA)
Carter (GA)	Hunt	Rogers (AL)
Carter (TX)	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Chavez-DeRemer	Jackson (TX)	Rose
Ciscomani	James	Rosendale
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Cloud	Johnson (OH)	Roy
Clyde	Johnson (SD)	Rutherford
Cole	Jordan	Salazar
Collins	Joyce (OH)	Santos
Comer	Joyce (PA)	Scalise
Crane	Kean (NJ)	Schweikert
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Self
Curtis	Kiggans (VA)	Sessions
D'Esposito	Kiley	Simpson
Davidson	Kim (CA)	Smith (MO)
De La Cruz	Kustoff	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	LaLota	Smucker
Donalds	LaMalfa	Spartz
Duarte	Lamborn	Stauber
Duncan	Langworthy	Steel
Dunn (FL)	Latta	Stefanik
Edwards	LaTurner	Steil
Emmer	Lawler	Steube
Estes	Lee (FL)	Stewart
Ezell	Lesko	Strong
Fallon	Letlow	Tenney
Feenstra	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Ferguson	Lucas	Tiffany
Finstad	Luetkemeyer	Timmons
Fischbach	Luna	Turner
Fitzgerald	Mace	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	Malliotakis	Van Drew
Fleischmann	Mann	Van Dуйne
Flood	Massie	Van Orden
Foxx	Mast	Walberg
Franklin, C.	McCaul	Waltz
Scott	McClain	Weber (TX)
Fry	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Fulcher	McCormick	Wenstrup
Gaetz	McHenry	Westerman
Gallagher	Meuser	Williams (NY)
Garbarino	Miller (IL)	Williams (TX)
Garcia, Mike	Miller (OH)	Wilson (SC)
Gimenez	Miller (WV)	Wittman
Gonzalez, Tony	Miller-Meeks	Womack
Good (VA)	Mills	Yakym
Gooden (TX)	Molinaro	Zinke

NAYS—203

Adams	Castor (FL)	Eshoo
Aguilar	Cherfilus-	Espallat
Allred	McCormick	Evans
Auchincloss	Chu	Fletcher
Balint	Cielline	Foster
Barragán	Clark (MA)	Frankel, Lois
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Frost
Bera	Clyburn	Gallego
Beyer	Connolly	Garamendi
Bishop (GA)	Correa	Garcia (IL)
Blumenauer	Costa	Garcia (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Garcia, Robert
Bonamici	Craig	Golden (ME)
Bowman	Crockett	Goldman (NY)
Boyle (PA)	Crow	Gomez
Brown	Cuellar	Gonzalez,
Brownley	Davids (KS)	Vicente
Budzinski	Davis (IL)	Gottheimer
Bush	Davis (NC)	Green, Al (TX)
Caraveo	Dean (PA)	Grijalva
Carbajal	DeGette	Harder (CA)
Cárdenas	DeLauro	Hayes
Carson	DelBene	Higgins (NY)
Carter (LA)	Deluzio	Himes
Cartwright	DeSaunier	Horsford
Casas	Degrell	Houlahan
Case	Doggett	Hoyer
Casten	Escobar	Hoyle (OR)

Huffman	Moskowitz	Schrier
Ivey	Moulton	Scott (VA)
Jackson (IL)	Moran	Sewell
Jackson (NC)	Mullin	Sherman
Jackson Lee	Nadler	Sherrill
Jacobs	Napolitano	Slotkin
Jayapal	Neal	Smith (WA)
Jeffries	Neguse	Sorensen
Johnson (GA)	Norcross	Soto
Kaptur	Ocasio-Cortez	Spanberger
Keating	Omar	Stansbury
Khanna	Pallone	Stanton
Kildee	Panetta	Stevens
Kilmer	Pappas	Strickland
Kim (NJ)	Pascarell	Sykes
Krishnamoorthi	Payne	Takano
Kuster	Pelosi	Thanedar
Landsman	Peltola	Thompson (CA)
Larsen (WA)	Perez	Thompson (MS)
Larson (CT)	Peters	Titus
Lee (NV)	Petterson	Tlaib
Lee (PA)	Phillips	Tokuda
Leger Fernandez	Pingree	Tonko
Levin	Pocan	Torres (CA)
Lieu	Porter	Torres (NY)
Lofgren	Pressley	Trahan
Lynch	Quigley	Trone
Magaziner	Ramirez	Underwood
Manning	Raskin	Vargas
Matsui	Ross	Vasquez
McBath	Ruiz	Veasey
McClellan	Ruppersberger	Velázquez
McCollum	Ryan	Wasserman
McGarvey	Salinas	Schultz
McGovern	Sánchez	Waters
Meeks	Sarbanes	Watson Coleman
Menendez	Scanlon	Wexton
Meng	Schakowsky	Wild
Mfume	Schiff	Williams (GA)
Moore (WI)	Schneider	Wilson (FL)
Morelle	Scholten	

NOT VOTING—13

Castro (TX)	Kamlager-Dove	Scott, David
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Swalwell
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Wagner
Ellzey	Luttrell	
Foushee	Nickel	

□ 1358

Messrs. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and PALLONE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 203, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

AYES—218

Aderholt	Boebert	Clyde
Alford	Bost	Cole
Allen	Brecheen	Collins
Amodei	Buchanan	Comer
Armstrong	Buck	Crane
Arrington	Bucshon	Crawford
Babin	Burchett	Crenshaw
Bacon	Burgess	Curtis
Baird	Burlison	D'Esposito
Balderson	Calvert	Davidson
Banks	Cammack	De La Cruz
Barr	Carey	DesJarlais
Bean (FL)	Carl	Diaz-Balart
Bentz	Carter (GA)	Donalds
Bergman	Carter (TX)	Duarte
Bice	Chavez-DeRemer	Duncan
Biggs	Ciscomani	Dunn (FL)
Bilirakis	Cline	Edwards
Bishop (NC)	Cloud	Emmer

Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Flood
Flood
Franklin, C.
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)

Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Pence

Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Santos
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Van Orden
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—203

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragan
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cardenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow

Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)

Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross

Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Sykes

Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velazquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Castro (TX)
Cleaver
Cohen
Davis (NC)
Ellzey

Foushee
Kelly (IL)
Lee (CA)
Luttrell
Nickel

Scott, David
Swalwell
Wagner

□ 1405

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LUTTRELL. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcall Nos. 165 and 166. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 165 and "nay" on rollcall No. 166.

LOWER ENERGY COSTS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 260 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1412

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to lower energy costs by increasing American energy production, exports, infrastructure, and critical minerals processing, by promoting transparency, accountability, permitting, and production of American resources, and by improving water quality certification and energy projects, and for other purposes, with Mr. ISSA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 7 hours, with 6 hours equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees of Energy and Commerce and Natural Resources or their respective designees and 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAL-LONE) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 90 minutes. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas, (Mr. WESTERMAN.)

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

As an engineer, I have learned that no issue is too difficult for American innovation and ingenuity to solve when we honestly identify the problem, develop a sound plan to solve it, and do the hard work to get the results we desire.

The truth we all know is America has an energy crisis. Energy is foundational to everything we do, and for the sake of our future, we must solve this problem.

Energy prices, in general, have gone up nearly 40 percent in a little over 2 years. High energy costs translate throughout the economy, causing inflated prices for every necessity of life, from the food we eat to the clothes we wear to the roof over our heads.

President Biden has said he is working to lower these costs. But his actions are drowning out his words. He has waged war on American producers, shutting down oil and gas leasing, banning mining development in certain areas, and insisting on keeping our Federal regulations permanently stuck in the past.

□ 1415

What are we getting in return?

We are getting more dependence on the worst polluters in the world while we wreck our own economy sending our wealth and jobs overseas.

Our current energy policies favor Putin, the Chinese Communist Party, and despots around the globe over the American people and freedom. Why would our friends across the aisle continue to put the worst polluters, human rights violators, and those who wish us harm above the American people?

No more. H.R. 1 is designed to solve our energy crisis. House Republicans are ready to show the world that American energy—not Saudi Arabian, not Venezuelan, not Chinese, or Russian energy—American energy is our future. American mining, American innovation, American processing and refining,

American manufacturing, and American infrastructure will lead us out of this energy crisis.

H.R. 1 outlines this through a variety of measures. First, it rolls back the Biden administration's oil and gas leasing moratoriums, giving producers certainty to produce resources safely and responsibly right here at home.

Next, given the importance of minerals to our national security, clean energy technology, and a host of everyday uses, H.R. 1 shores up domestic supply chains for commodities like copper, lithium, and cobalt, and allows us to make our energy infrastructure where it should be made—right here at home in the United States.

Every ounce we produce here is an ounce less we and our allies are forced to purchase from Chinese-controlled mines with deplorable labor and environmental standards. And, of course, none of this is possible without modernizing the Federal regulations that delay the projects we desperately need.

If you don't believe permitting reform is needed, maybe you will believe President Biden's senior adviser, John Podesta, who recently said: "We can move faster by setting tighter deadlines for agencies to complete environmental reviews. We can move smarter by making it easier to approve projects with low environmental impact . . . But Congress needs to do its job . . . So it is time to get back to work and pass permitting reform legislation."

We are called to be good stewards of our resources and leave them better than we found them. That is the definition of conservation. We cannot say our global resources are better off today under Democratic policies. China is building coal plants at a rapid pace, using slave labor to construct solar panels and develop critical minerals, while Russia is not only one of the worst environmental catastrophes on the planet, but they are also using their energy revenues to fund their war in Ukraine.

We cannot continue to turn a blind eye to these injustices and say, "not in my backyard." America drills, mines, builds, and innovates cleaner, safer, and more responsibly than anywhere else in the world.

Before American innovators and workers can solve our energy problems, we need a plan. H.R. 1 is the plan to solve our energy crisis.

For these and many more reasons, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Lower Energy Costs Act. H.R. 1 is the blueprint to ease the burden of this self-inflicted energy crisis on American families.

H.R. 1, when executed, will make the United States more secure and competitive on the global stage. Ultimately, H.R. 1 will improve the health and longevity of our natural resources, create a better climate, and spur economic growth and jobs—these are results we should all get behind.

Mr. Chair, you don't have to be an engineer to solve this energy problem.

I urge all of my colleagues to join with me and vote a resounding "yes" in support of H.R. 1.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2023.

Hon. BRUCE WESTERMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WESTERMAN: I am writing regarding H.R. 1335, the Transparency, Accountability, Permitting, and Production of American Resources Act, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Natural Resources on March 9, 2023.

The bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget. In order to expedite House consideration of H.R. 1335, the Committee on the Budget will forgo action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in H.R. 1335 or similar legislation and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that the Committee may address any remaining issues that fall within its jurisdiction. The Committee on the Budget also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and requests your support of any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1335 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee report and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration of H.R. 1335.

Sincerely,
JODEY C. ARRINGTON,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, March 21, 2023.

Hon. JODEY C. ARRINGTON,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ARRINGTON: I write regarding H.R. 1335, the Transparency, Accountability, Permitting, and Production of American Resources Act, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Natural Resources on March 9, 2023.

I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget and appreciate your willingness to forgo action on the bill. I acknowledge that the Budget Committee will not formally consider H.R. 1335 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained therein.

I am pleased to support your request to name members of the Committee on the Budget to any conference committee to consider such provisions. I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Committee Report for H.R. 1335 and the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation.

Sincerely,
BRUCE WESTERMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, March 24, 2023.

Hon. BRUCE WESTERMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter confirms our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1335, the "TAPP American Resources Act". Thank you for collaborating with the Committee on Agriculture on the matters within our jurisdiction.

The Committee on Agriculture will forego any further consideration of this bill. However, by foregoing consideration at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over any subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. The Committee on Agriculture also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees should it become necessary and ask that you support such a request.

We would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1355, and request a copy of our letters on this matter be published in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,
GLENN "GT" THOMPSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2023.

Hon. GLENN "GT" THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write regarding H.R. 1335, the Transparency, Accountability, Permitting, and Production of American Resources Act, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Natural Resources on March 9, 2023.

I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and appreciate your willingness to forgo action on the bill. I acknowledge that the Committee on Agriculture will not formally consider H.R. 1335 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained therein.

I am pleased to support your request to name members of the Committee on Agriculture to any conference committee to consider such provisions. I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation.

Sincerely,
BRUCE WESTERMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, today I rise in urgent opposition to the Republicans' H.R. 1.

Last week, the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued its final report. Their message couldn't be clearer. We have a lot to do and very little time to do it before the ticking climate bomb we are living in goes off.

I want to emphasize that their message wasn't one of complete despair. There is hope. The hope hinges on two major conditions.

One, we must stop burning fossil fuels, the number one cause of climate change. And two, we must transform our energy system to a cleaner and more sustainable one now.

H.R. 1, the bill before us today, which has earned the fitting title of polluters over people act, will actively and aggressively take us backwards on both those accounts.

Looking more like a nearly 200-page love letter to polluting industries than a serious legislative effort, the polluters over people act is a laundry list of gifts and giveaways to polluting industries.

Let's look at what it does for Big Oil. For example, last year companies shattered profit records across the board by price gouging working Americans at the pump while also hoarding thousands of unused leases on our public lands and waters.

Rather than hold Big Oil accountable for this abuse, the polluters over people act lowers royalty rates, repeals interest fees, reinstates noncompetitive leasing, and forces Federal agencies to hold rock-bottom lease sales all but assuring that last year's profit records will soon be broken again.

Never to be outdone, the mining industry gets its fair share of gifts in H.R. 1, as well. Mining companies, many of which are foreign-owned, already enjoy a free-for-all on our public lands. They make a mockery of Tribal consultation, destroy sacred and special places, ruin the landscape, and leave behind a toxic mess that pollutes our water and hurts our health—all without paying a cent to the American people—not one red cent is paid in royalties.

Now included in this package is that they can use the public land for anything they want, including dumping of toxic mineral waste.

There is more, but suffice it to say, with all these handouts, it comes as no surprise that the Congressional Budget Office just reported last week that H.R. 1 will actually increase the Federal deficit.

Staying true to its name, the polluters over people act also fast-tracks dirty energy projects by gutting our bedrock environmental and public health laws; namely, the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.

This is not in a new so-called permitting reform solution they have come up with to address our energy needs. This is the same ideological attack I have seen Republicans in the Natural Resources Committee launch on NEPA year after year after year.

For anyone who is being lured into thinking there are opportunities for negotiations on this bill—do not be naive. This performative permitting reform is not a bipartisan solution, not even a starting point for one.

This is just another decades-old request from polluters to make their operations cheaper and easier, while making Americans' lives harder and more costly.

It is not a serious solution to any of our energy goals. Even former President George W. Bush's head of permitting efforts has said that this bill will be "of no statistically significant consequence."

In fact, the polluters over people act has none of the real permitting solutions that can speed up the build-out of the clean energy infrastructure that we all need.

One of those solutions would be increasing funding for Federal permitting offices, which is exactly what Democrats did when they secured more than \$1 billion in last year's historic Inflation Reduction Act. Even Republicans' own witness at a hearing called that money "wonderful." No more funding is in H.R. 1.

Another solution for speeding up clean energy development is reforming the planning and cost allocation process for electrical transmission lines that can carry renewable energy from different sources across the country. But, no, you are not going to see that in H.R. 1 either.

Of course, any real permitting reform solutions would make sure to protect and empower the communities that have been disproportionately hurt by dirty energy and other polluters for decades—and that are now being hit the hardest by climate change as well.

As you can probably guess, H.R. 1 doesn't just fail to protect these communities, it silences them further, laying them bare to even more devastation, harm, and exploitation.

The polluters over people act isn't just an embarrassment of riches for polluting industries, it is an embarrassment to our communities, to our climate goals, and to this legislative body.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, this utopian idea of having our cake and eating it too, the "not in my backyard" mentality, it just won't work for the economy or the environment. That is why we need change.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, someone who knows the importance of energy to production agriculture.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Let me be clear, a vote for H.R. 1 is a vote for food security. Let me repeat that. A vote for H.R. 1 is a vote for food security.

Let me explain. As chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and proud Representative from Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District, I am no stranger to the challenges facing America's energy industry and its direct impact on farming communities.

In fact, the Commonwealth showcases the nexus between energy and agriculture production each and every day.

Pennsylvania is home to abundant natural resources from Marcellus shale natural gas play to America's first commercial oil well. These are responsibly developed resources that have provided energy affordability to our

Nation for generations and transformed the U.S. into a global economic powerhouse.

These resources have also helped spur our State's largest industry—agriculture. And just like any other region of the country, the viability of our ag sector is relying upon access to abundant and affordable energy.

By gambling away American energy independence and domestic oil and gas production in the name of climate change, the Biden administration has harmed the very industry—U.S. agriculture—that contributes to 13 percent of our annual greenhouse gas sequestration.

The hardworking men and women who feed and fuel our Nation in the world are, in reality, climate heroes.

Even still, this administration has continued to take irrational regulatory and policy actions that foster uncertainty and limit our ability to meet the food, fiber, and energy demands of our Nation and the world.

This legislation provides a reprieve for America's families, including our farmers, ranchers, and foresters, who have struggled with fractured supply chains, skyrocketing input costs, and historic levels of inflation, all of which are exacerbated by excessive spending and regulatory overreach from Washington.

American agriculture, if given the right tools and regulatory certainty, can serve a vital role in alleviating global food instability and mitigating costs for consumers.

H.R. 1 provides this certainty and will deliver long-lasting relief for nearly every sector of the U.S. economy.

As I have always said, food security is national security. We need dependable local power generation, adequate infrastructure, a strong workforce, and lower energy costs for farm operations to remain viable. It is time we return to embracing American energy, not abandon it, and in doing so, enable America's agriculture sector to thrive.

House Republicans made a commitment to an economy that is strong. Through H.R. 1, we are upholding that promise.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, we heard the term NIMBY thrown around to describe opposition to this bill. This NIMBY term, not in my backyard, is used to describe local residents, oftentimes very wealthy residents, who oppose development in their neighborhoods, but unfortunately support development of it elsewhere.

This NIMBY term is being used by some to try to discredit opposition to this bill. In reality, the groundswell of opposition of this bill comes from places that look like places behind me, not Martha's Vineyard—places like Cancer Alley along the Gulf Coast, and many other environmental justice communities across the country that millions upon millions of American call home.

Make no mistake, the greatest consequences from pollution giveaways in

H.R. 1 will fall on places like the ones in this photograph that are already overburdened by industries' pollution.

Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to this legislation. First, I thank the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee for yielding.

Climate change is an existential threat to the United States and the world. Without action to reduce emissions, the damage to our Nation, economy, and future generations will be immeasurable.

Americans understand the severity of this moment. That is why polling shows that most Americans want to prioritize the development of alternative energy sources over expanding the production of fossil fuels.

□ 1430

The bill before us today will do the exact opposite. H.R. 1, the polluters over people act, is a brazen giveaway to the oil, gas, and mining industries.

As Big Oil reaps record profits thanks to billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies, this bill will rubberstamp the construction of new natural gas pipelines and shut government agencies out of the review process.

H.R. 1 will also mandate the auctioning of our public lands for oil and gas leases, make it easier to export liquefied natural gas to foreign adversaries, and allow oil companies to price gouge working families.

This bill effectively gives energy companies a license to pollute. Simply put, it is a disaster for our environment and our fight against climate change.

Americans do not want energy policy to come at the expense of public health. Many of my constituents have suffered for years from air pollution emitted from a local plant that runs on burning natural gas and fuel oil. This pollution has resulted in generations of families developing asthma in what is colloquially known as asthma alley.

H.R. 1 will encourage this dangerous pollution in communities across the country. That is why I have submitted two amendments. One will protect these at-risk localities by removing restrictions preventing individuals from suing in response to a violation of NEPA if they bring a claim related to protecting public health. My second amendment would require publicly traded companies to disclose their goals and actions related to greenhouse gas emissions and meeting the goals of the Paris climate accord.

These amendments were rejected by the Rules Committee, as were over 90 percent of the amendments proposed by my Democratic colleagues. So much for the open amendment process Republicans promised when they took over the majority.

H.R. 1 is a reckless bill that empowers polluters to boost profits for Republicans' industry friends.

Last year, Democrats acted to lower energy costs for working families and weaken our dependence on fossil fuels by passing the Inflation Reduction Act. The IRA was the largest-ever investment in fighting climate change while creating thousands of good-paying jobs, attracting billions of dollars in investment, and lowering the average American family's energy costs by about \$1,800 a year.

H.R. 1 seeks to reverse the progress we have made since passing the IRA. Mr. Chairman, this bill will take us backward both economically and environmentally, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the rhetoric is just not matching the reality. The reality is that current energy policies are forcing us to buy energy and minerals from the worst polluters on the Earth. Not only are they the worst polluters; they are the worst human rights violators.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER), who serves on the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WESTERMAN for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am honored to support H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, to increase energy production, export American energy, and build out our infrastructure to transport it.

All of our constituents have seen and felt the impact of the constraint on and the cost of energy. Sadly, we don't have to go too far to see the impact of this administration's efforts to harm domestically produced energy.

From the cancelation of the Keystone XL pipeline, a moratorium of oil and gas leases on Federal lands, and the self-destruction of our offshore lease programs, it is hard to imagine just how far this administration will go to prop up unrealistic, utopian ideas—utopian ideas that a country could solely exist on wind and solar without oil and gas.

By the way, there is a whole lot of information on wind and solar that doesn't get advertised all that much: the fact that the materials necessary to build those components come from mining that we have largely prevented ourselves from doing and have to import from overseas, the cost of the transmission, and the fact that those rotors on the wind turbines need fossil fuels to continue to operate. Nevertheless, that is the evangelism we have been given by the current administration.

Americans are paying the price for this utopian future, and they are paying it right now. With this just transition to other forms of unreliable energy, the cost is borne by the most vulnerable among us.

That is why Republicans are leading the way to unleash the full potential of

American energy through H.R. 1. H.R. 1 means no more begging the Saudis for oil, ignoring the humanitarian crisis in Venezuela, and forgoing American workers, industry, and expertise.

H.R. 1 means abundant energy for all Americans in an environmentally responsible way.

Republicans are also leading the way with all forms of energy. That is why I am thankful for the inclusion of my CLEAN Act in H.R. 1 to promote the responsible exploration of geothermal resources on Federal lands.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WESTERMAN for his leadership, and I look forward to the passage of H.R. 1.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the polluters over people act.

Protecting our environment is foundational to the heritage, culture, and quality of life that we enjoy in the Pacific Northwest. We are trailblazers in clean, renewable energy sources like hydroelectric, wind, and solar.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle should follow our lead and focus on accelerating our transition toward a green energy economy like Democrats did in the Inflation Reduction Act. Instead, Republicans are pushing a messaging bill loaded with giveaways to the fossil fuel industry that will blow a \$2.4 billion hole in our deficit.

This legislation not only does nothing to lower energy costs, but it raises prices for families by repealing Inflation Reduction Act discounts for energy-saving home appliances.

I offered an amendment to this bill, with the support of every Democrat from the Washington and Oregon delegations, that would prevent oil and gas companies from drilling along the Washington and Oregon coasts. The last thing any of us want is the next Deepwater Horizon spill on our shores. This was rejected by the majority. An open amendment process apparently only applies to Republicans.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), who is another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support today of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Since coming into office, the Biden administration has taken steps to depress domestic energy production, causing prices to skyrocket and making America reliant on our adversaries for energy.

From heating our homes to filling our gas tanks, Americans have been burdened with historically high energy prices. With growing global demand predicted year after year, we must pass laws that will make America energy independent.

H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, is crucial in restarting our onshore and offshore leasing program. It also incentivizes the production of domestic minerals that are essential for national security and sustainable energy projects.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about all this electrification.

Mr. Chairman, do you know what needs electrification? Copper.

Do you know what the other side has done? They have started to ban copper mines.

I don't know how you make this happen unless, I guess, they want us to buy copper from China. It makes sense to me: Buy copper from China and be reliant on people who don't like us.

You can see the production here, Mr. Chairman. Look at Chinese copper production. Look at United States copper production.

I know what the other side wants. They want us to be reliant on China.

Modernizing our Federal regulations needs to happen so we prevent projects from being in endless litigation.

Mr. Chairman, let's do the things that are sustainable and necessary for our economy and that are necessary to making sure that we are energy independent.

H.R. 1 incentivizes an all-of-the-above energy approach. This legislation promotes domestic sources of materials critical to renewable energy while maintaining robust environmental standards.

American energy is the cleanest in the world. We can and we must produce our own energy in an efficient, clean, and safe way for Americans. We can do that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 1 to eliminate red tape and promote affordable domestic energy production.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, let me remind my colleagues that this bill provides more handouts to foreign mining companies with terrible environmental and human rights records.

For example, Rio Tinto, a foreign-owned mining company, is preparing for a new copper mine in Arizona at a sacred site, Oak Flat. In 2020, the company knowingly and needlessly demolished a 46,000-year-old sacred Australian aboriginal site, an irreplaceable cultural artifact, to expand an iron mine.

This bill rolls out the welcome mat for even more mining by foreign-controlled companies with records of human rights violations, cultural desecration, and pollution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN), who is a valued member of our committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

Although energy independence and lower costs are laudable goals for any energy legislation, unfortunately, this

bill achieves neither. Instead, H.R. 1 is a giveaway to Big Oil and their lobbyists, who want to be able to set their own rules at the expense of working families. Instead of putting the needs of the American public at the center of this bill, my friends across the aisle drafted an industry wish list.

First, H.R. 1 undermines landmark environmental laws and protections like the Clean Water Act and the National Environmental Policy Act that safeguard public health and keep our drinking water and air clean. It also repeals the methane emissions reduction program, which helps companies reduce their methane pollution.

This bill makes it easier for polluters to set their own standards and roll back reforms, and it lets Big Oil rubberstamp their own projects with minimal oversight. Environmental disasters are far too common, and unfortunately, H.R. 1 would make it easier for future disasters to happen.

Second, the polluters over people act worsens the climate crisis by empowering the fossil fuel industry instead of strengthening the foundation for a clean energy future, which is so important.

During the last Congress, the 117th Congress, we passed policies—many bipartisan policies—like the bipartisan infrastructure law, the CHIPS and Science Act, and the Inflation Reduction Act, that invested in climate action at a scale matching the challenge that science tells us that we face.

This bill that we have before us today not only ignores the additional steps we need to take to reach our climate targets, but it actively takes us backward on climate action by rolling back key provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act, which was and is the most significant environmental and climate bill that has ever been passed in the United States or anywhere else.

We know that data is alarming. A new U.N. report found that global warming could increase by 3.2 degrees Celsius and cause 7 feet of sea level rise by the end of the century if immediate actions are not taken. This is an existential crisis.

Climate change is real. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know it is real, and we cannot continue to deny this and put our planet at risk with this type of legislation.

Instead of wasting time on this Big Oil wish list, I would like for us, instead, to focus on actions that will actually expand the employment of clean energy, reduce costs, expand high-capacity transmission, reform the interconnection process, and build on the \$1 billion that we secured in the Inflation Reduction Act to ensure that Federal agencies have the resources and expertise to conduct efficient environmental reviews.

□ 1445

Third, H.R. 1 adds to the deficit. That is right, it adds to the deficit by giving handouts to big oil and gas corpora-

tions so that their executives and their shareholders can get even richer.

For a party that is focused—at least, I hear that they are—on tackling the deficit, I think it is pretty extraordinary that this legislation, their signature legislation would add to the deficit.

Last year, when Americans were dealing with high costs at the pump, fossil fuel executives were taking in record profits. In fact, 26 of the country's largest oil companies made a record-breaking \$451 billion last year, just last year, and they spent over \$163 billion on stock buybacks and dividends to their shareholders.

These same companies donated over \$370,000 to my friends across the aisle, so it is no wonder they want to reward their friends. It is clear that this legislation, the polluters over people act, is another giveaway, to keep corporations rich at the American people's expense without making meaningful reforms. In fact, while making things worse. For all these reasons and more, I strongly oppose this legislation.

Mr. Chair, I proposed four amendments that would begin to correct course, but unfortunately my friends across the aisle are only allowing two of those amendments to come to the floor.

My first amendment that was blocked would clarify that lead Federal agencies can extend a public comment period or gather further community input if the Secretary determines that doing so would improve project results or efficiency.

This would allow agencies to actually streamline the permitting process by ensuring that potentially impacted communities and local governments have the ability to fully engage in the process.

Instead, my friends across the aisle chose to block consideration of this amendment and perpetuate the myth—it is a myth—that community input somehow slows down project approvals.

My other amendment that was blocked would have banned offshore drilling off the southern California coast. Californians of both political parties have made it absolutely clear, overwhelmingly clear that they are strongly opposed to additional offshore oil and gas drilling in southern California off the coast.

This amendment would have offered this Congress an opportunity to respect the will of the overwhelming majority of Californians who oppose drilling off our coasts.

I strongly urge my friends across the aisle, allow debate on these and other amendments so that more voices are heard.

As my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee have heard me say before, I am willing to work with anyone—anyone—on either side of the aisle to meet the goals of lowering energy costs and protecting our planet, particularly in terms of promoting a more efficient and transparent permitting process. I hope we can do that.

We can find common ground on pragmatic solutions. This is not common ground. I encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I heard the word "rich" mentioned a few times. I will tell you what is rich is when our colleagues across the aisle project their energy policies onto our plan. Again, the only polluters who are being put over the people are China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia.

Talk about big oil company profits, I read where Aramco, a Saudi company, had record profits last year, \$161 billion in profits. I believe that is the country that President Biden went to and asked them to increase production because we weren't making enough at home.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), the chair of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, before I begin my speech, I just want to tell the American people, you are not hearing all the truth on this. Sometimes my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will try to repeat things, mislead the American people. It is rinse, lather, repeat. The American people are smarter than that.

H.R. 1 is a priority for this Conference. It helps to modernize the permitting process.

Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1, Majority Leader Scalise's Lower Energy Costs Act, a bill I am an original cosponsor of, helped to write, and a bill America needs now more than ever.

I am also pleased that the House Natural Resources Committee received primary jurisdiction. I thank the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure for their important contributions as well.

Americans put Republicans in control of the House, in part, because we campaigned on making life more affordable and making it easier to build. We want to let miners mine, farmers farm, builders build, and let small businesses succeed. However, under today's permitting scheme, that is all but impossible.

In the district I represent, we have a proposed mine that would provide a huge resource of copper, nickel, cobalt, a huge resource of those critical minerals that we need, and it is on year 20 of permitting and litigation. It has a signed project labor agreement, committed to domestic union labor for the mine's construction.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle at every turn reject that mine as well as this administration does. This mine has won every lawsuit thrown its way, but further frivolous litigation and endless bureaucracy continue to mire the project year after year. We can help to build the energy transition with domestic minerals mined by Minnesotans, but the permitting bureaucracy stands in the way.

That is why I am proud that my own legislation, which has 33 cosponsors, the Permitting for Mining Needs Act, is included in the base text.

PERMIT-MN creates what miners want. They want certainty. It limits frivolous litigation, puts in place commonsense review timelines, and just puts American miners to work, whether they are in Minnesota, Alaska, Arizona, Nevada, California, or anywhere else.

This is about so much more than mining. If you are at all serious about emissions reduction, you will vote to support H.R. 1.

Why? Because right now, for example, it takes years to decades to permit transmission projects that will add wind and solar to the grid.

At our February 9 oversight hearing on permitting, American Clean Power testified that failure to enact permitting reforms puts an estimated 100 gigawatts of clean energy projects at risk.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. LETLOW). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, that means risking \$100 billion worth of investment and 150,000 potential jobs in the clean energy sector.

In the Natural Resources Committee, we have a real tangible example. At our February 28 legislative hearing on my colleague GARRET GRAVES' BUILDER Act, Dairyland Power testified about the Cardinal-Hickory Creek transmission line. This transmission line, which will put more wind power on the grid, is about 103 miles long, but it is locked in year 7 of permitting.

We need to pass H.R. 1 for energy independence and critical mineral dominance.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is too bad that my Republican colleagues continue to point to Chinese and Russian practices to try to lower the bar for environmental and community protections in our own country. The United States should lead, and we shouldn't set our standards by China or Russia.

The American people want their protections, they want clean energy, and they want the process that allows the American people to know and to participate. This bill does none of that.

Madam Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN. Madam Chair, I am going to be honest. I am at a loss for words.

This bill, the polluters over people act, is bad for the consumers, bad for the environment, and bad for the U.S. economy. You wouldn't know that from the rhetoric across the aisle, leaving me to wonder whether they are all lying or just ignorant. I am going to give them the benefit of the doubt here and assume they are ignorant.

Since I am at a loss for words, as I said, I am going to try to explain this with some numbers. Since 2010, the United States economy has grown by \$7 trillion. That is about 50 percent. During the same period, natural gas consumption in our country is up 25 percent, only half as much. Petroleum consumption is flat. Coal consumption is down by 40 percent.

This is awesome news. We should all be celebrating. We have decoupled economic growth from fossil fuel consumption. We can grow without depending on environmental degradation. The environment and American energy consumers are winning. That is not because they are using less energy. It is because they are not paying for it. You don't pay for solar energy. You don't pay for energy efficiency.

Remember, no one wants a barrel of oil. What you want is a cold beer and a hot shower. Now, Americans are getting more of the latter with less of the former, and if that confuses anybody in this body, then I would encourage you to go ask your local 6-year-old, what would you rather have on Christmas morning; a warm fire and some twinkly lights or a big old lump of coal? Like I said, this isn't that complicated.

Let us now ask what the fossil fuel industry has done in the wake of their collapsing market share. Did they pivot to providing things consumers want—cleaner, cheaper energy?

Did they redeploy their capital into solar, wind, geothermal, electric vehicle charging stations?

Of course not. They moved to strip-mine the United States and asked for your acceleration of their work.

During the same period, U.S. exports of oil have grown by a factor of four. U.S. exports of natural gas have grown by a factor of six. Their revenues that Mr. LEVIN talked about are not going up because they are selling more of their product to Americans, it is because they are strip-mining America and selling it overseas.

Exporting U.S. energy does not lower the price of energy in the United States. If anything, it raises costs to American consumers because you reduce domestic supply, for goodness sakes. This bill would only make that worse.

To be sure, there are real challenges facing U.S. energy consumers. We have an aging grid. We need transmission to connect renewables to load. We have got the growth in electric demand thanks to all those EVs and heat pumps. We should be focusing on those challenges if we are looking out for the American consumer, but this bill does not give a damn about the American consumer. Its sole purpose is to transfer wealth from the American taxpayer to American energy exporters.

There are a small number of Americans whose wealth depends on oil and gas production and export—you all know them by name, I am sure—but every single American benefits from cheaper energy, and if you are going to

claim to support the interests of the latter, vote “no” on this bill. If you are voting “yes,” at least have the dignity to be honest about whose interests you are looking out for.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the senior Republican on the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman, who is doing a great job as chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, for yielding.

Madam Chair, what should be crystal clear by now is that our friends across the aisle do not have solutions to the energy crisis. For the last 4 years, Democrats have controlled both Chambers of Congress, but in that time, not one single piece of serious legislation was ever introduced which would have lowered the cost of energy. After seeing costs rise for years on end, voters decided that they had had enough and elected Republicans to solve this crisis.

In 2019, a gallon of gas cost just over \$2. Today, it costs almost \$4. The price of groceries has gone up, as the price of energy to ship and keep them cool has gone up as well. Some items have seen as high as a 55 percent increase.

What has been done to help ease energy costs?

What solutions do my friends across the aisle have?

As a result of President Biden’s Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, the United States pumped \$75.8 billion of taxpayer money into unreliable green tech. Besides that, Americans have pumped trillions of both public and private dollars into these industries for decades, but solar and wind combined still only make up 10 percent of American electricity generation.

Instead of making existing technology more affordable, this administration and its allies in Congress dumped billions of dollars into technologies that cannot provide reliable and dispatchable energy to even a fraction of the country. This so-called solution has done nothing to lower costs for the average American. We have higher costs. There is more potential for rolling brownouts. This is the best that my friends across the aisle can do.

An intelligent person would think, why not continue to invest in affordable and proven technology while we are waiting for these alternatives to become viable?

They might be in the future at some point. That is great. But right now it is only 10 percent of our national electrical production.

The PJM Interconnection, for example, which is a grid that services over 65 million people, has announced that they will be short 26 percent of their total energy obligations because radical environmentalists are retiring energy sources while providing no reliable backups.

□ 1500

EPA also recently finalized what they are calling the “Good Neighbor”

rule by denying 26 different State plans to conform to EPA ozone regulations.

This denial means that 26 States, including my State of Colorado, will have sources of energy generation completely shut down while having no viable backup whatsoever.

This decision guarantees that costs and shortages will continue to increase for the American people with no end in sight.

Maintaining affordable energy is crucial to our way of life. It is what keeps water treatment plants open. It is what keeps hospitals open. It is what keeps traffic lights, libraries, schools, trucks, ships, and airplanes operating.

When the cost of powering these essential processes go up, costs go up. If the grid shuts down, everything relying upon it goes down. This will have catastrophic consequences.

Those of us around the country have seen what happens in places like California with its unrealistic energy policies and want nothing to do with it. High prices and shortages come with overregulation.

Let’s face the facts: Current green tech cannot come anywhere close to powering our Nation right now or in the foreseeable future.

The Energy Information Administration expects fossil fuel demand to continue rising, not decreasing, beyond the year 2050.

Ironically, as an aside, fossil fuel industries have always made a higher profit when there is a Democratic President because of the increased per barrel price of oil, but that is just an aside.

Republicans also aren’t neglecting permitting realities by ignoring unused drilling permits. We simply recognize that those permits on their own are insufficient to generate investment and production, especially when this administration is doing everything it can to discourage the producers of conventional energy.

What should be clear in this debate is that Republicans are the ones who know how energy works, and we are passing legislation.

H.R. 1 is serious legislation that will lower costs. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, just a reminder. H.R. 1, the polluters over people act, repeals the \$4.5 billion home electrification rebate program designed to lower energy bills for all American families.

Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.)

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Chair, there was some discussion earlier and an allegation made that Democrats have yet to introduce any policy to reduce our energy costs, as if we have completely forgotten about the sweeping, multibillion-dollar investments in the Inflation Reduction Act to reduce people’s costs across the board.

I am rising today to stand in opposition to H.R. 1. While Republicans try

to claim that this is a bill to lower people’s energy costs, what we really see when we start digging into it, is that what this bill actually shows us by the Republican authors is that they actually have no plan to reduce our utility bills or even prevent climate disaster in the United States.

The central argument and logic of this bill is that if you give Big Oil everything they want, then perhaps they will lower our gas prices.

It is a form of trickle-down fantasy that just will not make life easier for everyday Americans. What H.R. 1 will do is give Big Oil more leases of public lands.

This idea that an increased supply of fossil fuels will drive down prices is also mistaken. Let’s look at what happened last year.

We saw how Big Oil more than doubled its profits to \$219 billion, all while price gouging customers at the pump, not because of supply issues but because they can.

Republicans opposed solutions that we put forward, like a windfall tax on price gouging on Big Oil in order to prevent these kinds of behaviors.

Fossil fuel companies, moreover, already have thousands of unused permits on public lands, yet they want even more. This is not a problem of supply. It is a problem of greed and abuse of market power.

I, along with many of my colleagues, called for that windfall tax.

What does this bill do instead?

It is almost as if you gave a pen to an oil lobbyist and wrote down everything that they want. Much of that is in this bill.

We are looking at reducing Big Oil’s royalty rates to the public and slashing interest fees.

For people following at home, if you are a member of the American public, if you are a taxpaying citizen, you are part of the ownership of our public lands.

When an oil company decides to lease that land, they are supposed to pay a royalty to the public.

What does H.R. 1 do?

It slashes that royalty rate so that there is very little payback or investment into the American people and many of our programs.

In this bill, Republicans are squarely on the side of fossil fuel companies. It makes it harder for communities to fight Big Oil when they don’t want them drilling in their own backyards.

It also threatens our public lands and allows anyone to stake a mining claim on our public lands for less than \$10 an acre, even if they haven’t discovered any minerals.

Despite the fact that more than 40 percent of Americans live in counties hit by climate disasters, this bill prohibits agencies from even considering climate change when deciding whether or not to issue a permit to a drilling company.

None of these things are going to lower our costs at the pump. None of

these things are going to actually reduce our utility bills.

In fact, in talking about this allegation of a lack of Democrat proposals, Democrats introduced 95 amendments, proposed 95 amendments to this bill, and the Republican majority rejected all but seven.

I, myself, personally sponsored an amendment in the spirit of this bill, allegedly, to try to reduce prices, and my amendment would have made sure that the subsidies that the Federal Government provides to oil and gas companies actually make their way to the American people—instead of lining the pockets of billionaire CEOs—and actually have the intended effect.

Republicans rejected that amendment, too. They have made clear where they stand. I cannot emphasize enough how detrimental and damaging this bill would be, not only to the climate crisis, not only to the purpose of even trying to reduce our utility costs, but moreover, for the ability for the American people to actually receive an investment on the public lands that they lease out.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, the Inflation Reduction Act that has been referenced here, it did invest in energy companies: energy companies in Saudi Arabia, energy companies in China, and energy companies in places like Russia and Venezuela and Iran at the cost of the American people.

The bill also referred to—outside of the House Chambers—is the climate bill, referred to by my colleagues across the aisle. It did one thing to inflation, it drove inflation up at the cost to the American taxpayer.

Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, everything around us that makes our lives possible is either mined, or it is grown. Everything.

Above the Speaker's chair is a plea from Daniel Webster to those who serve in this House. "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers . . . and see whether we also, in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Yet, for 50 years, the environmental left has slowly strangled our Nation's ability to do just that. In the process, it is impoverishing the American people.

One of its most powerful weapons is the National Environmental Policy Act imposed in 1969 with the promise that it would protect the environment.

It has done exactly the opposite. It has made it endlessly time consuming and ultimately cost prohibitive to manage our forests, to provide abundant water for our people, and to prosper from our vast energy and mineral resources.

My district comprises the forests of the Sierra Nevada and the agricultural heartland of California's Central Valley.

The left promised us that NEPA would protect our forests and water resources. Come to my district, and you will see what a cruel and demonstrable lie that has become.

Excess timber is removed from our forests in only two ways. If we don't carry it out, nature will burn it out.

Throughout the 20th century, the U.S. Forest Service marked off surplus timber and auctioned it to logging companies that paid us to remove it.

The result was healthy, resilient, and fire-resistant Federal forests, a steady revenue source for forest improvements, and thriving mountain economies.

Then came the National Environmental Policy Act. Simple forest thinning projects now require an average of 4½ years of environmental studies, costing millions of dollars, more than the value of the timber.

Instead of making money for the government, removing excess timber now costs us money. As a result, our forests have become morbidly overgrown, carrying four times the timber that the land can support.

In that stressed condition, the trees succumb to disease, pestilence, drought, and ultimately catastrophic wildfires we haven't seen in over a century.

California is one of the most water-rich regions of the country. Yet, the farms of the Central Valley have had their water systematically choked off because NEPA and other environmental laws make major new reservoirs all but impossible to build. Record rainfall this year is being lost to the ocean simply because we have no place to store it.

When the little town of Foresthill tried to add a \$2 million spillway gate for additional water storage, they discovered that because of NEPA, they also had to budget an additional \$1 million for environmental reviews and \$2 million for environmental mitigation.

After more than a decade, the project has yet to be built. The last reservoir over a million acre-feet constructed in California was completed in 1979. Meanwhile, the State's population has nearly doubled.

Madam Chair, when something is plentiful, it is cheap. When it is scarce, it is expensive. NEPA is making everything we depend upon in our lives increasingly scarce, and therefore, increasingly expensive.

The left obsesses over a 1-degree rise in temperature over the next century, but they couldn't care less that they are making it impossible for people to heat their homes in subfreezing winters.

They promise us they care about the environment, but they couldn't care less that entire human communities' and species' habitats and millions of acres of forest are being laid to waste by preventable mega fires.

They obsess over the snail darter but couldn't care less that they have destroyed thousands of agricultural jobs,

idled a half million acres of California farmland, and sent grocery prices skyrocketing.

They promised us that NEPA would protect our forests. Instead, it is destroying them.

H.R. 1 begins to dial back the damage that NEPA has done, both to the environment and to the quality of life of all Americans, simply by reducing the time and cost required for these massive bureaucratic studies.

The question before us is whether our children will grow up in a world of scarcity, poverty, and misery or one of abundance, prosperity, and optimism.

That is the simple question before us. We choose prosperity; a future of abundant and affordable energy, water, food, lumber, minerals, and all the material comforts and benefits that flow from the resources our country has been blessed with.

That is something worthy to be remembered, and that future can begin with this vote today.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LANDSMAN).

Mr. LANDSMAN. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, a very unpopular and wholly unhelpful bill.

The debate on this bill has to be put in the context of two very important things: inflation and costs, including gas prices, but also this broken economy that many feel is rigged.

Both Democrats and Republicans in my district talk about this all the time. You see, there are those with power and wealth, and then there are the rest of us.

It seems like those who have the power and the wealth keep getting more and more, and the rest of us keep getting less and less.

We ask, why is this?

We ask ourselves how can gas prices go up while our bank accounts go down; yet oil companies see profits skyrocket?

□ 1515

How is that not a broken economy? It does beg the question: Is it rigged?

Now we arrive at this bill. Let's be clear, Americans don't want more giveaways furthering this imbalance. They want relief.

Many of us are proposing that relief in energy rebates—direct assistance to help Americans pay for gas and their heating bills.

H.R. 1 just furthers this imbalance. Instead of direct assistance for Americans, which Americans want, it is more giveaways for oil and gas companies. The oil and gas companies have said two things about this bill: one, it is not going to help us speed up the process; and two, thank you for all the giveaways. We love them.

They get more power, build up more wealth, and we get, one, no relief on prices; two, a bigger deficit to deal with; and, three, the loss of local control and input. We actually lose power.

The environmental impact study is where we as Americans weigh in. This bill is controversial and problematic because it takes more away from us and gives more and more and more to a few companies.

That is the broken economy. That is why people think this system is rigged. That is why my colleagues should vote “no.”

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN), another Member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this bill because this legislation will restore and secure American energy independence.

I am especially supportive of this bill's provisions to modernize the NEPA process. Look how long it takes for many of the permits to actually be approved. It streamlines the Federal permitting process for all industries. These commonsense reforms will provide the necessary certainty so projects across the Nation are carried out in a timely manner without sacrificing our environmental standards which are the most robust in the world.

This will be critical for jurisdictions like mine in Puerto Rico, as we rebuild our public and energy infrastructure from recent natural disasters. Modernizing NEPA and the Federal permitting process—setting clear and reasonable timelines for agencies to conduct environmental reviews—will help simplify the process and reduce bureaucratic hurdles that too often have delayed our recovery process.

This bill will also establish a revenue-sharing structure for offshore wind leases in Federal waters. I was proud to work with Chairman WESTERMAN during our committee markup to secure language clarifying that both coastal States and territories will receive revenues from any Federal offshore wind development off their coasts.

Specifically, this bill establishes a framework under which coastal States and territories will get funds for these offshore wind revenues. This bill further requires that States and territories invest these funds in coastal protection and resiliency projects, such as hurricane and flood protection, restoration, conservation, beach nourishment, and estuary management.

Therefore, this is not just an energy security and permitting reform package. This is also a coastal resiliency bill. For that reason, and knowing that we got billions of dollars in Federal funding for reconstructing the island, this is the process we need, this is the reform we actually need to get those funds in hand.

I thank and commend Majority Leader SCALISE, Chair WESTERMAN, Chair RODGERS and Chair GRAVES for their leadership and work on this important, powerful legislation.

I wish I could vote for this bill on the floor of the House today, but as a terri-

tory delegate I cannot, but I support this bill.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for her input on the bill and for her great ideas.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, I wish to raise my voice against H.R. 1, this bill that has been given the moniker “polluters over people.” I think it is an appropriate moniker, and I will tell you why. It doesn't create energy independence any more than anything else we are doing in the energy sector. It doesn't save people money. This is money that will go into the pockets of Big Oil and big polluters.

We all saw during the pandemic when the price of oil per barrel leveled off, the price at the pump per gallon kept going up and up and up, and everybody who was filling up their gas tank and feeling like they needed to get an on-site mortgage to do it, knew where that money was going. It was going into the pockets of the oil companies.

You know what else it doesn't do? It doesn't save our government money. In fact, it costs our government money. \$400 million extra this will add to the annual deficit if we pass this bill, this polluters over people bill.

You know, the question is: Well, what does it do? Well, it does away, Madam Chair, with bedrock protections for the things that people count on the government protecting: clean air, clean water. It does away with the National Environmental Policy Act almost entirely, and it guts the Clean Water Act.

This is not what Americans signed up for for their government. In fact, there are statutes, there are protections that were put in place during Republican and Democratic administrations over the years. It has become things that Americans have learned to depend on, to count on, that the government is going to keep their air and their water clean for them. This takes that away. It eliminates it.

What else does it do? It is going to cost homeowners money. It takes away the electrification program that will give them rebates to redoing the electricity in their house.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Finally, what it does is it throws up the white flag in our war against climate change. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs in this country, General Milley, has identified climate change as a threat to national security, and he is right.

We are in a fight against climate change. This is not the time to throw up the white flag and run away from a fight. Americans don't do this. I say stick up for people over the polluters,

people over politics. Vote “no” on H.R. 1.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I find it ironic that a Member from Pennsylvania, where one of the largest deposits of natural gas in the world resides, would call the producers in Pennsylvania the polluters versus the ones in Russia and Saudi Arabia.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman, BRUCE WESTERMAN, for his work.

Madam Chair, the chairman mentioned something about our last speaker from Pennsylvania. I am a little concerned. Maybe he didn't have time to read the whole bill because the bill he described is not the bill that is before us.

He said somehow this would harm the environment. He was concerned about climate. If this bill passes, global emissions will be reduced. The chairman pointed out that the gentleman before, from the other side of the aisle, from Pennsylvania was criticizing this bill and he talked about the natural gas. I am not sure if the gentleman on the other side of the aisle has done any research or if he knows that American natural gas is 41 percent cleaner than Russian natural gas.

It is an interesting little fact. If we had replaced for 1 year just Russian natural gas to Europe, we would have reduced CO₂ emissions by more than 200 million tons.

So, Madam Chair, it really begs the question: Who is the polluter? Those who defend Russia and vote against this bill. It is interesting the people opposing this bill, those I am hearing on the other side of the aisle—China, Russia, and OPEC. It is interesting the friends you keep.

Now, let's talk a little bit about this. If you go across this country, Madam Chair, it costs too much to heat your home and fill up your car. It cost less an administration ago.

Today, more than one-third of all Americans say they have skipped buying food or medicine to pay an energy bill in the last 12 months. We are going to have opportunity this week to make sure that they don't have to do that again if you vote “yes.” This is neither affordable nor sustainable.

In response, President Biden has paid lip service to the need of more energy production, but this is a public relations stunt. Almost every one of his policies involves penalizing America and empowering China.

Now, here are the facts: For years, President Biden and Democrats have attacked energy producers, blocked new leases on Federal land, and ground the permitting process to a halt. Their so-called Inflation Reduction Act included a natural gas tax, a \$27 billion climate slush fund.

The gentleman on the other side of the aisle from Pennsylvania, he supported taxing the natural gas that is

produced in his State and creating a slush fund.

Meanwhile, in my home State of California, burdensome environmental laws have led to recurring blackouts and more red tape that raises costs for everything. Rather than increasing production and providing good-paying jobs, California imported more than half of its oil from Ecuador in recent years.

The interesting fact here is, when the Democrats took control of California under Governor Gavin Newsom, he reduced the amount of oil produced in California by 20 percent. That was 80,000 barrels a day. That doesn't mean California used 80,000 less barrels; it meant California started paying Putin for 50,000 barrels. They get the majority of their oil from Ecuador, from the Amazon.

Instead of producing it in an environmentally sound way in California, we are harming the environment. That is exactly what this bill is able to do—lower global emissions, lower the price of energy, and make the world more secure and safe, because then Putin and Russia is not controlling Europe.

Democrats have sent a clear message about their priorities. They are the party of \$5 gas, subsidizing Communist China and the never-ending dependence on foreign dictators for minerals we have in America.

It was only a few short years ago where America produced more of the critical minerals than China, but as the Democrats would shut down leases, make it harder to open new mines, they moved it to other parts of the world, and not in an environmentally sound way, but by empowering China, making them stronger, and making the price in America higher.

Luckily, Congress has the opportunity to change the behavior of Washington by passing the Lower Energy Costs Act. Every Member of this chamber should support it. I understand why Russia and China oppose lower energy costs for America and making America stronger, but I don't understand why Members in this Congress would stand with China and Russia against America.

The Lower Energy Costs Act does two important things: One, it restores American energy leadership by repealing unnecessary taxes and overregulation on American energy producers so we can lead the world in providing clean, affordable energy.

Two, it makes it easier to build things in America. For example, this bill includes a 2-year time limit on environmental impact statements. It also streamlines the process for lawsuits so that activists can't use the courts to delay projects for years.

Ninety years ago, American workers built the Empire State Building in 400 days. That is 13 months. These days, however, even repairing existing structures, just like Lake Isabella Dam in my district, has taken 18 years, and that was only because we were lucky in pushing for it.

That is exactly how the Big Government under the Biden administration wants the system to work. Every time we need a pipeline, a road, or a dam, it gets held up on an average of 5 to 7 years and adds millions of dollars in costs for the project to comply with Washington's permitting process.

□ 1530

It is too long. It is unaffordable. It is not based on science. It is holding us back. It is time we speed up the time it takes for us to build all kinds of things in America. We could streamline permitting, stop abusive lawsuits, protect the environment, and, importantly, lower the price of energy.

This is why the Lower Energy Costs Act is H.R. 1. It signals how important the bill truly is.

Madam Chair, when the Democrats were in the majority, do you know what their H.R. 1 bill was? Election. Why? They wanted to change the election law to try to guarantee their right to be reelected. You see, they looked after themselves.

When Republicans took the majority, our H.R. 1 is about lowering energy costs for all Americans. We think it is important to serve others, not yourself.

I get permitting reform isn't for everyone. If you like paying more at the pump, you don't want to make it faster for American workers to build more pipelines. If you are China, you would rather America sit back and let others lead. If you are a bureaucrat, maybe you really do enjoy reading the 600-page environmental impact studies.

The rest of America wants lower prices, more cash in their hands, more good-paying jobs in America, and rules that are good for the environment. That is exactly what the Lower Energy Costs Act does.

Madam Chair, America has the potential to become a true energy superpower. God has blessed us with abundant energy, and we shouldn't have to depend on other countries for our future. In fact, we should make the world dependent on us for energy. The world would be cleaner and safer, and America would be better off.

If you want to have a responsible energy policy where America produces more energy, pays less for a gallon of gas, and never again bows to foreign dictators, vote "yes" on the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Three things will happen when this bill becomes law.

Your energy costs will be reduced. You will have more cash to take care of your family, to pay for your medicine, to take your family on vacation.

It will reduce global emissions, so environmentally, the world will be a better place.

It will make the world a safer place, so no longer does America pay Putin for dirtier oil or gas, so no longer does China control other nations because they control the critical minerals that America will not produce. No longer

will we watch, as we watched in the 1930s, countries bound together to create an axis of power.

We have now watched China enter the Middle East to bring Saudi Arabia and Iran together. That used to be the role of the American President at Camp David. It is no longer.

We do not want to watch our President travel to the Middle East to beg to produce something more when America can produce it here in an environmentally sound way.

Madam Chair, I know why Russia and China fight this bill so hard. I do not understand why those on the other side of the aisle join with Russia and China. I ask them to join with Americans and make America safe and environmentally sound and the world a more secure place.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When we were in the majority, Democrats, we passed H.R. 1. What was that about? It was not about elections. It was about our democracy. It was about protecting that democracy. After January 6, that became urgent.

Now, some might want to deny that—that was just a walk in the park, people taking a stroll. We were here. We knew what was going on, and the American people knew what was going on.

The issue of patriotism has been brought up. It is patriotic for us to oppose polluters over people. It is patriotic because we care and feel that the public health of the American people needs to be protected, that we have to deal with climate and the crisis that we are confronting.

To question the patriotism of those instincts is wrong, and we will continue to represent the American people on their most urgent needs. The future and their destinies shouldn't be turned over to Big Oil and Big Gas and the mining industry, for them to determine that future. They have to have a role, and our statutes and the protections that are in our laws need to be part of that role.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member for the time because my residents are already hurting. H.R. 1 would devastate their lives even more.

Environmental impact statements change lives for the better, from air monitoring, pushing back against the corporate polluters that, again, just want to make a profit over the public health impact that would happen if we just gave them free rein.

This bill is nothing more than a cheap political stunt to pad the profits of the same greedy oil and gas companies that are price gouging our residents at the pump and poisoning the air they breathe and the water they drink.

These are the same oil companies that donated hundreds of thousands of

dollars to House Republicans and made nearly half a trillion dollars in profits last year alone.

Their servants across the aisle don't think that is enough. They want to gut our most important critical environmental and public health protections, leaving our communities at the mercy of corporate polluters that have shown time and time again they will sacrifice our lives, our public health, to make more money.

Make no mistake, this bill destroys the National Environmental Policy Act and the Clean Water Act. It guarantees there will be more oil spills. It guarantees more water crises, more deaths, and more suffering.

Once you get beyond the BS, the truth is clear. Health protections for you and your family aren't making gas expensive; corporate greed is.

The greedy oil and gas companies have gotten away with price gouging and stock buybacks that enrich their shareholders but make everything less affordable for our residents. They don't plan to stop because their greed is only enabled with bills like this.

The amazing thing about this, about colleagues trying to run leaky oil pipelines through our communities, is that the bill isn't even popular. The American people get it. They understand the urgency of the climate crisis, the importance of protecting our air, our water. They want the government and corporations to take serious action to make sure their lives are protected.

Yet, here we are, debating a bill that wraps climate denial and corporate giveaways into one tidy, toxic package as the world burns.

Our residents, my residents, are already struggling with health disparities. They deserve better. They deserve to breathe the clean air.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), another member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

America has an abundant supply of minerals, oil, and gas, and my State of Arizona ranks first among all States for non-fuel mineral resource production.

While the mining industry is still thriving in Arizona, primarily due to previously started mines, the Biden administration, and some in this very Chamber, have purposely slow-walked the permitting approval process, threatening this critically important industry.

H.R. 1 incentivizes domestic mineral production, unlocking resources that are vital for national security, renewable energy, and new technologies, like mineral processing, refinement, and concentration. This typically has been sent overseas to China, which then, in turn, monopolizes and holds these critical and rare resources ransom through supply chains.

Sadly, Arizona has two of the last three copper smelters in the United States, to which we hold to the highest environmental safety standards.

Allowing China to process these minerals is a continual slap in the face of the United States' stringent and responsible environmental laws.

Not surprisingly, it takes more than a decade, sometimes even two, to permit a mine in the United States. Canada can permit a mine in less than 3 years.

H.R. 1 modernizes the Federal regulations that delay projects for decades. H.R. 1 will help restore America as the global leader in energy technology development and protect Arizona's mining industry from the Biden administration and the leftists who want to shut it all down.

Madam Chair, I applaud Chairman WESTERMAN for his leadership, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1. The mantra should be: Now mined in America. Now refined in America. Now built in America.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), my good friend.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, with this bill, our Republican colleagues offer their answer to our overheated planet, turn up the heat. And to those parents concerned about their children's future in what could become an uninhabitable planet, they say quite simply, "shut up and get out of the way."

This dirty bill will not bring our energy costs down, but it will drive our hospital bills and our doctor bills way up because it is a dirty deal.

Republican fossilized thinking threatens the health of millions of Americans and endangers the future of our planet.

Our country should be the world's leader in combating the climate crisis and growing the many new jobs that are necessary to develop the new technologies to combat the ravages of an overheated planet. But instead, the Republicans surrender the green technology leadership to China and other countries around the world.

Protecting American families from the climate crisis should be a bipartisan issue, but it has increasingly become one as most of our Republican colleagues ignore the dangers and remain beholden to polluters over people.

Last year, we made some modest progress under Democratic leadership. We offered incentives for both businesses and families to come together to slow carbon pollution, to go electric, to improve energy efficiency, and to develop additional renewable energy resources.

Instead of adding to that progress, which we need, Republicans today would drag our country back to the disastrous years of their hero, Donald Trump, who abandoned American leadership in favor of more and more pollution.

Only this month, the world's scientists have told us once again: "There

is a rapidly closing window of opportunity to secure a livable and sustainable future for all." Republicans want to slam that very window shut.

As the U.N. Secretary General declared: "Humanity is on thin ice, and that ice is melting fast. Our world needs climate action on all fronts, everything, everywhere, all at once."

This bill doesn't deserve its designation as H.R. 1. It is not even H.R. 0 because it drags us backward into a world in which our grandchildren will not be able to safely reside.

And even for those who won't listen to the scientists and the world leaders near unanimous view on this, all they need to do is just open their eyes. The extreme weather that we see, the intensified heat, the mega-droughts, the ice storms, the tornadoes and hurricanes, and heat, heat, and more heat in places that it has never occurred before, threatening food production and human health. All of this, along with the threat of tropical diseases appearing in places like Central Texas where they have never occurred before.

The climate crisis is already taking lives, and it will take many, many more the longer we are delayed by outrageous tactics like we see here today.

This sorry bill will never become law, but every day that Republicans dither, delay, and distract us; every day they feed the ignorance about the climate crisis, the nearer we come to a tipping point from which we can never recover.

I am voting "no" because, left unchecked, Republican half-baked ideas will burn up our planet.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The ideas of the Republican Party will do more to reduce global carbon emissions than anything that the Democrats have proposed, especially the legislation they passed in the last Congress that is actually incentivizing foreign production of energy.

I remember distinctly President Biden going over and fist-bumping the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia. Then, this year, guess what? Saudi Arabia's state-owned oil company reported the highest profits ever—\$161 billion, for an oil company.

□ 1545

They are the plans that we are putting in place, H.R. 1, that will help the planet. It is not the continued misguided principles that are putting the real polluters, the global polluters, ahead of the people.

It is ironic that a Member from Texas would think that producers in Saudi Arabia and Russia and Venezuela are polluting less than the oil producers and the energy producers in the State of Texas.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Chair, as I travel across Montana and meet with constituents, I hear the same thing.

They want our Federal Government to remove the barriers that lead to incredibly high energy costs that they face to operate their farms, their businesses, and their homes.

A lot of politicians here in Washington don't understand these struggles. They don't understand that their policies, which caused diesel prices to go up, dramatically increase input costs for farmers. They haven't had to endure a Montana winter where temps can hover between 10 and 20 degrees below zero for extended periods of time. The Energy Information Administration estimated that it cost Montanans 30 percent more to heat their homes last year, thanks to the Biden administration's policies. That is not pocket change.

Lowering energy costs and restoring our Nation's energy dominance will require an all-of-the-above approach and a dismantling of the Biden administration's green energy policies. That is why H.R. 1 is such a comprehensive reform bill, with input from representatives from every part of our Nation.

Since Biden entered office, his administration has held zero lease sales for energy development on public lands. That is why I reintroduced the Restore Onshore Energy Act to be included in this package. It would force the administration to immediately resume quarterly lease sales dictated in the Mineral Leasing Act and further require the Department of the Interior to immediately hold replacement sales when the sales are missed.

In addition to resuming lease sales, H.R. 1 will repeal harmful royalty and fee increases, streamline the Federal permitting process under NEPA, and require more transparency from the Federal Government, among many other provisions. This is about cutting through bureaucracy and fighting the radical environmentalists to allow our energy sector to get back to work for the American people.

We know that energy independence isn't just a critical component of our national security and supply chain, but it also affects agriculture, the largest industry in Montana. The President's policies caused a 150 percent increase in transportation diesel prices since he took office. This directly contributes to market access, complications for farmers and ranchers, and increases inputs, like fertilizers and pesticides and labor and many other things. All of this results in higher food costs at the grocery store and a decrease in revenue margins for agricultural producers.

In the words of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, farming looks mighty easy when you use a pencil for a plow and you live a thousand miles away from a cornfield.

It is time for Congress to stand up to unelected bureaucrats and the radical environmentalists controlling our executive branch and setting policies without regard to the impact that they will have on the people in Montana and real America.

Madam Chair, I support H.R. 1 and hope my colleagues will do the same.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, the Republicans claim that they will do more to reduce emissions with this legislation than Democrats have done. I remind everyone that this legislation, the House Republican H.R. 1, has no emission reduction targets and the push is to increase fossil fuel production, which is the highest source that contributes to the climate crisis that we are facing now.

Madam Chair, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), a member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1.

As one of the few Members who serves on both the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Natural Resources, I have seen almost every version of this package as it was crafted. Hearing after hearing and markup after markup, it has been clear. I love my Republican colleagues, but they are more focused on advancing partisan bills that will benefit the oil, gas, and mining industries while selling out landmark environmental laws in the name of permitting reform, instead of advancing meaningful, bipartisan solutions for the American people that will help us achieve our climate goals and solidify our energy security for future generations.

For months now, my Republican colleagues have called for policies and permitting reforms in Congress that would strengthen our energy security. I have consistently been willing to work with my colleagues—and still want to—in this pursuit, but what we have here is not reform.

Gutting the National Environmental Policy Act, otherwise known as NEPA, is not permitting reform.

Weakening enforcement under the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and other critical public health laws is not permitting reform.

Granting mining companies the ability to take minerals from public lands without paying a dime to taxpayers in royalties or helping clean up these toxic sites afterward is not permitting reform.

Forcing Federal agencies to hold oil and gas sales on public lands, even if they are not needed, is not permitting reform.

Repealing the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, a \$27 billion program, that I admit I helped author, to deploy clean energy projects nationwide and cut greenhouse gas pollution, is not permitting reform and will not strengthen our energy security in any meaningful way.

To my Republican colleagues who continue to refuse to believe the science or to acknowledge we are facing an existential threat from the climate crisis, just read the United Nations's most recent IPCC report from 2022.

This legislation instead puts polluters, profits, and pollution over the American people. It is that simple.

In order to truly attain meaningful energy independence here at home, we need a net zero energy economy built on solar, wind, hydropower, batteries, electric vehicles, and even nuclear.

What we cannot do is expect more drilling for oil and gas to solve all of our current and future energy woes. I do understand bad weather. The last four weekends, I have had snow and ice, and I have lost my electricity every single weekend.

Listen, we are at the beginning of a transformational shift toward a clean energy economy, a shift that has now accelerated due to the historic investments and legislation Democrats and the Biden-Harris administration were able to enact into law over the last 2 years.

This transition will likely present the greatest permitting challenge in generations. However, we must permit and build in ways that do not harm communities or our environment.

That is why Democrats enacted historic legislation last Congress, the Inflation Reduction Act, that directed over a billion-dollar investment to increase staffing and resources across Federal agencies for conducting efficient and effective environmental reviews and permitting.

The bill today doesn't have real solutions to high energy costs, and it is going to drive up the deficit, not according to Democrats, but according to the independent Congressional Budget Office.

I am pragmatic and I am seasoned enough to know we have a lot of work ahead. If we can do it collectively, Republicans and Democrats, it can serve as an important tool to combat climate change, strengthen our economy, and protect our national security.

But again, let me be clear: We must not entertain proposals that roll back landmark environmental laws across the board, including NEPA, so we can line the pockets of Big Oil.

As I mentioned at committee, when John Dingell and Senator "Scoop" Jackson originally authored and advanced the National Environmental Policy Act, it was done thoughtfully, through a meaningful legislative process, to build broad and bipartisan support. This is the process that we need.

We can't gut NEPA. It was brought about to include community and to care about the economy. We have got to work together. I remain open to working with my Republican colleagues on bipartisan energy security and permitting reform efforts. I hope we can. My colleague, the chairman, knows I want to, but I still do not see this legislative package as a serious proposal.

I don't want to be dependent on China more than anybody else does for our batteries, or Russia or any other country. We need to do it in the good ol' USA. We can do it with ingenuity, innovation, technology, and protect our environment at the same time.

Madam Chair, I am strongly opposed, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally to receive a message.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

LOWER ENERGY COSTS ACT

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CARL), another member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. CARL. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

I did not bring any fancy charts. I don't have any nice pictures for you to look at. But what I do want you to look through is my heart and my mind.

In 64 years of living, I have spent the last 2 years working with the other side of the aisle, watching them systematically take this country apart when it comes to our natural resources. Enough is enough.

You want me to prove it?

We just won the House. We have the majority now. We have a chance to change what is going on today.

Let me tell you what is going on. All we hear is: The sky is falling. The sky is falling.

I encourage people to get out from wherever you are hiding and look around, smell the fresh air, look at the sun shining. It is not falling.

It is like dealing with a bunch of guys practicing magic. They want you to watch one hand while they are picking your pocket with the other hand. I have had enough. I have had enough, and I think it is time we talk about it.

They have systematically shut down our copper mine, the largest copper mine on the North American Continent and in the world, so I understand. They have shut it down.

Who are we buying copper from now? China, a communist country we are buying all that copper from.

Excuse me. I have got a problem with that.

I look at my oil refineries and my gas refineries down in Alabama and outside of Alabama.

Those gas refineries, do you know what they are refining?

Venezuelan oil. Not American oil. Venezuelan oil from a communist country.

Is there a pattern here that we should be looking at? Is there a pattern of a communist regime here that we just keep getting pushed on us?

I just spent 2 weeks in Central America trying to figure out how we can keep a communist country from taking

over Central America. But we have this side of the aisle that wants to tell us the sky is falling. I refuse to believe it, and I refuse to give it up.

Voters made their voice heard last November when they sent Republicans to Congress to put an end to Democrats' anti-American agenda.

Americans are paying 40 percent more for their gas since President Biden took office, and the Democrats have done nothing but add fuel to the fire to raise that price by shutting down our drilling and shutting down our mines.

On the other hand, House Republicans this week are moving forward with the Lower Energy Costs Act, this act, which has two primary objectives here: Increasing American energy production—not communist—and to strip away the rules and regulations that make it harder for American infrastructure to grow this economy.

□ 1600

I am especially proud of this bill because I worked on part of it. The Unleashing American Energy Act is included in this package. My bill fights back on the Biden administration's war on our domestic energy production by mandating oil and gas lease sales each year in the Gulf of Mexico and off the coast of Alaska.

Let me remind my friends, most of these are union jobs. Unions are supporting you. Remember that. These are union jobs you are voting against.

House Republicans have a solution right here in this lower energy costs bill. I encourage all of my friends to vote on this bill. This bill will help end our reliance on these foreign countries—these foreign Communist countries. We need to reflect on that as we vote.

Madam Chair, if you support the Communist Party, vote "no" on this bill. If you support American jobs and if you support American families, vote "yes" on H.R. 1.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, if you believe in climate change and the climate crisis, vote "no" on this legislation. If you believe that regardless of ideology, if you believe that climate change is real and must be dealt with, vote "no" on this legislation because it does nothing to deal with that real threat in front of us.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. CROCKETT).

Ms. CROCKETT. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 1, the misleadingly named Lower Energy Costs Act.

I had everything written down of what I was going to say, but then I started hearing some other stuff. I decided that what I wanted to talk about is a few things.

Number one: I need the American people to understand that H.R. 1 means that this is the first bill. This is the bill that the party in power thinks matters most. This is where their pri-

orities lie. When you look at what the Democrats did, they decided that they wanted to stand for democracy after there were those that wanted to try to tear our democracy apart.

I have to rest here for a second, simply because at the time I was a Texas House Representative who had to flee my State because of voting rights. I urged this House to pass H.R. 1, simply because we were trying to make sure that people would not cheat in these elections.

Just because you have control of the House doesn't mean that you didn't take your time and gerrymander these lines because we know that is exactly what happened. That is the only reason that the Democrats are not currently in control. The reason that this margin is so tight is because our policies stand for the people.

Let's talk about this bill. This bill is about putting people over polluters. If we want to talk about what the Republicans do when they are in control and they get to decide about power, let's talk about the State of Texas.

Let's talk about the fact that we have left the State of Texas in the dark over and over. It was interesting to look across the aisle and see a sign that said that the Republicans will keep the lights on. Well, go talk to Texas and find out if the lights have been kept on or if we have been left in the dark.

We are consistently left in the dark because there is this idea that if we just go ahead and get rid of regulations that everything will work out. Unfortunately, it has not worked out. It has not worked out to the tune of us actually losing lives in the State of Texas.

That is why we are here standing before you, making sure that we are fighting for actual lower bills when it comes to our everyday working families that are already squeezed by inflation.

We heard Mr. Speaker talk about the fact that he wanted to make sure there was more money in people's pockets for medicine. When it came down to voting for the Inflation Reduction Act, I don't believe that there were too many Republicans that were voting for that—to make sure we could lower the cost of insulin—just to make sure that the RECORD is clear—if we want to make sure we are putting more money into their pockets.

House Republicans want to lower energy costs for big polluters, plain and simple. That means somebody foots the bill and somebody pays the price. Once again, go ask my constituents in Texas. We are the ones who are footing the bill for the failures of our grid over and over and over.

My constituents tend to be Black and Brown, mostly, and they tend to be those that are disproportionately living in polluted communities today, that are only able to breathe because of the scant environmental protections we actually have. They are being asked

to not only endure the brunt of pollution, but also endure the bill of pollution. I will not and I cannot stand for it.

When this bill guts Clean Air Act safeguards to let polluters earn profits faster by curtailing the already paltry public comment period, my constituents foot the bill.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. MACE). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. CROCKETT. Madam Chair, my constituents foot the bill with increased rates of lung disease, healthcare costs, and child mortality. Who foots the bill for these lower energy costs? Not the polluters.

It is the little girl on the playground in my district who is inhaling toxic fumes from the concrete plant right next to her school. That little girl will be scarred for the rest of her life with an increased risk of asthma, bronchitis, and cancer just so polluters can make a quick buck.

You know what makes it crystal clear who the supporters really care about? The Lower Energy Costs Act repeals the home electric rebate program passed last year to reimburse the cost of energy efficient home equipment that would have actually lowered Americans' energy costs.

House Republicans are lowering energy costs for polluters all right and lowering all of our life expectancy right along with it.

Madam Chair, H.R. 1 puts politics over people and puts polluters over people.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), who has offered so much positive input on the Lower Energy Costs Act. He is the author of the BUILDER Act and added so many other great provisions to this bill.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I can make posters, too. I think I got the right backdrop there. Let's talk a little bit about credibility. Let's talk a little bit about the challenges that this country is experiencing, like the little girl on the playground and what our families across America are experiencing right now. Let's talk about why.

This body is about credibility. It is about your word. Let's talk a little bit about why America is experiencing the challenges that they are. We are seeing higher electricity prices that are making American families unable to be able to afford medicine and groceries, refuel their car, or pay electricity bills. Why is that happening?

It is happening because my friends across the aisle have refused to produce American energy. It is a supply and demand issue. This happened when they gained power. The day the President of the United States was inaugurated, Madam Chair, gasoline prices in my home State were as low as a \$1.74 a gal-

lon. Let me ask you, where in the world are you going to find that today?

You have cut off production of oil and gas. Don't take my word for it. You know, one term I have never heard anybody say is bring back that Jimmy Carter energy policy. Yet, when Jimmy Carter was President, he leased 100 times more acres of the lands and waters for energy production. Why do we have a crisis in energy right now?

It was self-inflicted. Why has this administration and these Democrats sold off hundreds of millions of barrels of oil from our Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the emergency reserve that was designed for crises, not awful policy?

It is because they refused to produce energy. You have created a supply problem, and you are using our emergency reserves to address it.

You sit here and also raise royalty rates. You proposed increased pipeline fees. You proposed taxes or enacted taxes on American energy, all driving up the costs, then you sit here and wonder why we have high prices? These were all self-inflicted wounds. You did this to America—your policies.

Madam Chair, it is remarkable seeing what is going on right now, listening to my friends across the aisle talking about the environment. Yet, their own legislation requires the use of critical minerals that they at the same time have banned or prevented from being mined or processed or refined in the United States.

In some cases, China has 80 percent of these critical minerals locked up. If you force markets in the direction and if you force the use of those strategic materials, and the only place that has it is China, who are you benefiting?

China loves their energy policies. They benefit from it. All roads lead to China. Over 80 percent of the solar panels are made in China. Whenever this administration found that China was illegally subsidizing and illegally dumping solar panels in the United States, they banned them and put tariffs on them.

China then starts sending them through other countries. And you know what this administration does? They say: Yeah, that is fine. They acknowledge that there were Chinese solar panels being sent through other countries, and they allowed it. The Biden administration allowed it, and my friends across the aisle have done nothing to stop it.

The truth is, is that emissions have gone up under their policies, not down. Madam Chair, let me say that again. Under the previous administration, emissions went down. Greenhouse gas emissions went down an average of 2½ percent a year.

In the first year of the Biden administration, my friends across the aisle working with them closely, emissions went up 6 percent last year and went up another 1.3 or 1.4 percent. I am going to say it again. My friends across the aisle and their policies have resulted in higher greenhouse gas emis-

sions. They have increased our dependence upon foreign energy sources.

We had the Secretary of the Interior standing right in our committee, and he wasn't even aware that we had become increasingly dependent upon Russian energy.

They talk about corporate welfare. I agree, which is why the over \$600 billion that my friends across the aisle have put toward effectively bribing companies into investing in renewable energy sources that in many cases are not economic, simply doesn't make sense.

This bill follows logic. It follows good policy. It ensures that we are getting energy resources from the United States. It ensures the affordability by bringing American energy online. It results in lower global emissions.

Madam Chair, I urge support of this legislation.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1, which should be called the polluters over people act. This is a critical moment. Just last week, the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change released its sixth and final assessment, which presents our most comprehensive understanding of climate science to date. It is not, as my colleague suggested, that you can go outside and breathe fresh air and decide that there is no climate change.

Scientists have made it abundantly clear, there are two options: significantly cut emissions now or face catastrophic challenges ahead.

Future generations will look back and scrutinize the decisions we make as leaders. Did we have the political courage to take action or did we ignore science, stifle the most vulnerable voices in our community, and leave a climate catastrophe for our children and grandchildren?

In northwest Oregon, my home, smoke from raging wildfires made the air unhealthy to breathe, and in the summer of 2021 hundreds of people in the Pacific Northwest died from a 1 in 10,000 year heat dome event where temperatures reached 118 degrees.

Acidic oceans are harming our fishing industries. That is from carbon pollution. Droughts and extreme weather patterns jeopardize the livelihoods of our farmers. Warmer temperatures in the Columbia River are further endangering salmon that are so vital to the region and indigenous peoples.

H.R. 1 is a dangerous move in the wrong direction under the guise of promoting lower energy costs. It would do no such thing, and the American people will not be fooled. Instead, this bill is a package of anti-climate and anti-public lands policy that would undermine recent environmental protections, destroy the National Environmental Policy Act, and take a significant step back in the fight against climate change.

The bill will also raise, not lower, costs for working families by repealing tax cuts the Democrats passed last year for home efficiency upgrades. It even repeals the methane emissions reduction program.

While Americans faced higher gas prices, make no mistake, the top five big oil companies made record profits—more than \$196 billion last year—that is more than the economic output of most countries.

These companies abuse billions of dollars in taxpayer-funded subsidies, stockpiled thousands of unused leases on millions of acres of public lands and engage in price gouging at the pump.

This bill? It advances policies that allow Big Oil to increase their profits, even more at the expense of our constituents. The bill would expedite dirty mining operations, exempt oil, gas, and drilling industries from adhering to important environmental regulations, shorten public review timelines, and limit public engagement.

We must protect our bedrock environmental laws that safeguard communities and allow the public to have a say in local projects. We must continue the implementation of the Inflation Reduction Act, which finally, after so many years, will make significant investments we need to save our planet.

Addressing the climate crisis cannot be delayed. We must defeat this bill and turn our attention to investments that create jobs.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, we must defeat this bill and turn our attention to investments that create jobs, cut costs for working families, and grow our clean energy economy for the sake of our planet, our vulnerable communities, and for future generations to come.

□ 1615

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I checked. We are in the 118th Congress, even though our colleagues keep putting signs up to describe their so-called Inflation Reduction Act, the polluters over people act.

We also know they call this the climate bill. Even President Biden, in his State of the Union Address, talked about the \$370 billion investment in climate in the Inflation Reduction Act. We know that giveaway is not \$370 billion but now is being projected to be \$1.2 trillion in outlays—again, increasing inflation, not reducing inflation.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY), who is the chairman of the Federal Lands Subcommittee of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. TIFFANY. Madam Chair, on January 20, 2021, President Biden declared war on American energy when he shut down the Keystone XL pipeline. Today, we begin the process to lower energy

costs. This is the first stroke of what I hope are many bills to come forward to get energy costs under control for the American people.

Let's go back over the past couple of years of this Congress and what President Biden did. They passed things like the so-called Inflation Reduction Act. They passed a bill called the infrastructure bill.

What were those bills really and some of the others from the last Congress?

They were the Green New Deal. You, the American public, know now what the Green New Deal will do to you.

Let's talk about my district a little bit. Propane, which is a primary heating source for many of us in northern Wisconsin, we paid 80 cents a gallon in the summer of 2020 to fill our tanks. We paid \$2 a gallon—2½ times as much—to heat our homes just a couple of years after the previous administration had left office.

Think about the Ford Motor Company, an iconic company here in America. They lost \$2 billion on the electric vehicle segment of their business. I can tell you that contractors, loggers, and farmers are not going to drive a Ford Lightning in northern Wisconsin when it is 25 degrees below zero because it does not work.

I think about Vilas County, where they were going to apply to repair a road under the infrastructure bill. It would have cost \$1.5 million using Federal money. I talked to a local contractor. Without the Federal permitting requirements, they could build it for half of that, \$750,000.

One of the key provisions of this is the reform of NEPA. It does not change environmental standards. It just makes it easier to get projects done. It is time to reduce that red tape here in America on the American people and on American job creators.

Madam Chair, what is this all about at the end of the day? This is about whether you choose America or you choose Communist China.

Is this going to be a 21st century of the American people just like the 20th century was? It was one of the greatest centuries the people of this world had ever seen, when a country that was founded on liberty, freedom, and opportunity was ascendant, and we stood astride the world.

Are we going to do that in the 21st century? Bills like this are how we are going to make the 21st century an American century rather than a Communist Chinese century.

Let's lower energy costs and ensure job security, economic security, and national security for the American people.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1. It is a very

shortsighted, anti-science, anti-environment, and anti-family bill.

Last week, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change released its synthesis report and reminded us how urgent it is that we transition to a zero-carbon economy now. We need new clean energy, and we need it fast.

There is an opportunity for Congress to engage on permitting and transmission so new energy projects, especially clean energy projects, can get up and running as soon as possible. However, instead of a meaningful conversation, H.R. 1 is a sad regurgitation of the majority's bill from the 115th Congress with attacks on the Inflation Reduction Act.

Transmission conversations are completely absent, yet we know that investment in transmission is key to our energy future.

This bill will repeal important programs to help Americans make their homes energy efficient. These popular programs are already in motion to help families lower energy costs, and this bill will take them away.

H.R. 1 reduces the fees and royalties for oil and gas development, padding the pockets of oil and gas at a time when their record profits are at an all-time high.

This is not about energy prices for American families but profits for fossil fuel companies at exactly the time when the whole world knows we need to move away from them as quickly as possible.

On the one hand, my Republican friends are so concerned with the deficit that they are holding the economy hostage over their brinkmanship on the debt limit. Then, on the other hand, they bring a partisan bill to the floor that the Congressional Budget Office said will increase that deficit by \$2½ billion.

I implore my Republican colleagues to take the deficit seriously and pass a clean debt limit. Please take our energy needs seriously and our climate seriously and work with us on our transmission needs.

We are interested in the discussions. Our door is open when you want to work with us to get things done and move past partisan messaging bills that will be dead on arrival in the 60-vote Senate.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), who understands what bad energy policy does to rural America.

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Madam Chair, this administration's regulatory assault on American energy production has been devastating for my constituents in the Central Valley. Every week, I hear from my neighbors, friends, and constituents about the skyrocketing price of monthly energy bills.

Over the summer, people in California were paying over \$6 per gallon

for gas. It is unacceptable that even though America has some of the greatest energy resources of any nation in the world, my constituents are having trouble putting gas in their tanks and food on their tables.

That is why I am proud to support the Lower Energy Costs Act, and I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same. This bill will cut red tape and allow us to increase our supply of safe, clean, and affordable energy.

I am proud that language from my bill, the NEPA Adequacy Streamlining Act, is included in this bill. This makes the approval of new energy projects easier by allowing the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to use previously conducted environmental assessments for similar projects. This is a commonsense reform that removes one of the many layers of bureaucratic red tape in our permitting process.

This bill is full of the same types of policies that streamline our energy production to increase our supply of clean, affordable energy.

I want to respond to some of the opponents of this bill. My Democratic colleagues claim that this legislation is harmful to our environment. This is just not true. America has some of the strictest environmental standards of any nation in the world. When we produce energy here, we do it cleaner and safer than countries we would be importing it from.

Something important to remember is that decreasing domestic production does not reduce the demand for energy. Reducing our ability to produce oil and gas in the U.S. just increases our reliance on foreign countries for these imports. That means instead of using clean energy we produce here and creating good-paying American jobs in the process, we are reliant on imports from countries like Russia and Venezuela that are not held to the same environmental standards we have here in the U.S.

If your argument is that you want to reduce emissions, then increasing U.S. energy production is how you do it.

Despite wishes from the President and the far left, we cannot abandon traditional energy sources like oil and gas. While we as a country should continue to develop and pursue other energy sources, we will still need oil and gas for a long time. Why not produce it here in the U.S.?

I support an all-of-the-above approach to energy production and use, but that does not mean immediately transitioning to 100 percent renewable fuels. Until alternative energy sources are more reliable, we will continue to need transitional fuels.

If my Democratic colleagues cared about the environment as much as they say they do, then supporting the increased production of clean and reliable American-made energy should be a no-brainer.

Passing the Lower Energy Costs Act is a critical step to lowering prices,

creating good-paying jobs, and strengthening our national security.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1, the pollution over people act.

This is a bill filled with dangerous, unpopular, and unnecessary policy that will worsen our climate crisis—our existential climate crisis.

I am part of a generation who has grown up with the very real fear that, in our lifetimes, we will all experience an unlivable planet, that we will lack breathable air and drinkable water, that our houses will be destroyed again and again in natural disasters, that we will develop asthma and struggle to breathe, and that we will have a shortage of food.

Sitting here, I have heard a lot from my colleagues repeating that we need to lower energy costs. My question is: Where are the actions on ensuring that price gouging isn't happening at the pump?

This is exactly why energy costs are higher at the pump. I agree, but what about the real costs, the cost of life? What we know is that the cost of not doing anything is far greater than the cost of taking action right now.

You might not be the ones paying for it, but future generations will be, and I think a body like ours should be thinking about the future and the present.

Many people around the globe are already experiencing these threats. Among them are farmers, farmworkers, coastal communities, and community members who cannot afford air-conditioning costs.

I would like to believe that, out of compassion for my generation and our vulnerable communities, Republican Members of this body would come to the table and act in a bipartisan way to protect us from this fate.

It is possible to create a green transition so we can preserve jobs and the planet and create a whole new economy, a green economy, with good-paying union jobs for all of our people. We can invest in clean energy and train those working in the oil and gas industries so they can have new, good-paying jobs in fulfilling careers.

We can do these things, but right now, my Republican colleagues aren't. H.R. 1 is not about what is right for their constituents, working people, or what is right for the Earth. It is about what is right for oil and gas executives getting rich off polluting our planet.

This bill would bring back the defunct Keystone XL pipeline, reversing President Biden's wise executive action that ended it. It rubberstamps new construction of new pipelines.

Not only is this bill not informed about what is best for the future, but it looks like they haven't learned from what has happened in the past. This bill requires two new Gulf of Mexico oil

lease sites. This is very damaging to my home State of Florida.

It has been a tradition for both Democrats and Republicans from Florida to support no offshore drilling in the State of Florida. I am looking forward to seeing all of my Republican colleagues who are part of the Florida delegation voting "no" on this bill to keep intact their word. I know one of my colleagues said that this body is about integrity and keeping our word. I look forward to seeing those "no" votes.

In 2010, the Deepwater Horizon explosion pumped 210 million gallons of oil into the Gulf of Mexico, polluting more than 1,000 miles of Florida beaches with toxic oil. These literal waves of pollution closed beaches and deprived Floridians and visitors of 10 million beach days on our world-class beaches. The economic impact on our tourist industry was profound. The impact on our seafood industry was catastrophic. No one wanted a meal coming from a poisonous sea.

In this bill, Republicans are burying their heads in the oil-covered sand and requiring more oil lease sales in the area. I fear for the health of my community.

Florida is in the middle of a climate change crossfire. We have rising seas that are creating higher and more destructive storms. We just had Hurricane Ian last year, the deadliest hurricane in 100 years. Entire communities were completely decimated and wiped out. In Orlando, it caused flooding like we have never seen before, leaving constituents homeless.

H.R. 1 comes weeks after the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report. This report makes it clear: Continued greenhouse gas emissions will lead to destabilizing global warming, and our own only hope is rapid and sustained reductions in greenhouse gasses.

I heard a colleague blame Democrats for emissions. That is also not true, but I am glad to hear he was impassioned about blaming Democrats for increased emissions, which would lead me to believe that he agrees that we have to bring down emissions, which the report also said we have to do in a very quick way so we can have a livable planet.

Madam Chair, I will vote "no" on H.R. 1, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. We can and we must do better than this, not just for us but for future generations.

I invite my Republican colleagues to abandon this harmful bill and come to the table to work in a bipartisan way on smart energy policy because the decisions you make today will impact future generations and condemn my entire generation to a lifetime of suffering and put us on a path toward an unlivable future. I hope we will make the right decision.

□ 1630

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CISCOMANI). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JAMES).

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chair, I would like to start off by applauding my colleagues for including language in H.R. 1 that reaffirms our Nation's commitment to protecting freshwater resources, especially the Great Lakes.

This bill upholds our commitment to protecting our natural resources in Michigan and upholding the ban on oil and gas development in our Great Lakes. We are blessed with rich waterways and have an obligation to protect them.

We talk a lot about becoming energy independent, but what does this mean for our country and the American people?

It starts with access to essential resources without relying on the goodwill of foreign nations, especially our adversaries.

Mining is essential to our energy strategy and manufacturing independence. Without independent, secure, and safe minerals, there is no manufacturing independence. Worse, there is no national security.

I put forward the national strategy to reshore mineral supply chains amendment because I believe it is one of those commonsense issues that both sides can agree on.

Democrats have advocated for an electric future. That hinges on sustainably sourced mining.

Republicans have made it clear that establishing energy and manufacturing independence to grow our economy and lower prices is a top priority.

I have actually found a bipartisan partner in the White House. Last week, I asked Secretary Blinken whether he would be open to participating with me on legislation to create a 21st century national strategy to strengthen the American industrial base to reshore our critical minerals and end slavery in our supply chains.

His answer? We welcome working with you on that.

This amendment is a practical step toward that goal.

To the Chinese Communist Party, my amendment signals that America is done being taken advantage of. To the rest of the world, it shows that America stands strong and strategically. To hardworking Americans, it means lower costs and more money in their pockets.

I represent the number one manufacturing district in the country, but our Great Lakes are table stakes for anyone who seeks to represent them. We must have balance in how we approach this, and I believe H.R. 1 strikes that balance.

America has leaned on the 10th Congressional District in a world war and a global pandemic, and we expect to be called upon again. We will stand ready to help, but we must be prepared. That starts with a national strategy to reshore mineral supply chains. It is critically important.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1, House Republicans' polluters over people act.

When the House Democratic majority passed the landmark Inflation Reduction Act, they delivered key environmental safeguards to bolster our clean energy economy and lower costs.

The legislation that Republicans are bringing to the floor attempts to undermine those promising provisions because of political animus. Instead of trying to meet the needs of the American taxpayer, they are working to line the pockets of fossil fuel tycoons and exacerbate toxic mining projects that directly harm communities like mine.

H.R. 1 is not about the people, it is about a political win, and it is hokey. This legislation would undo significant environmental regulations central to our public health and environmental protections at a time when people are facing an alarming pattern of severe weather, lack of access to clean water and air, and blatant pollution across the country.

Pollution kills people. I can tell you that no one here is breathing dirty air. No one here is drinking dirty water. No one here is growing anything in dirty soil. If we are not, that means that no one else should be forced to do so.

It would roll back the environmental review processes under NEPA, putting community health and safety at risk while worsening pollution and the health risks associated with toxic chemicals such as PFAS, the same forever chemicals that are killing our firefighters.

I urge you to listen to the committee hearings where you will hear them say there is no need for community engagement, polluters can self-monitor.

That is why I was so disappointed but, oh, not surprised when Republicans voted down my amendment to include an environmental analysis and review of how oil and gas development will impact community health and safety because it will.

Instead, Republicans are so eager to rush into free-for-all oil and gas development that they are unable to reckon with the serious health consequences they are pawning off onto our constituents. You would have more respect for a bill if they cared enough about the health and safety of your community, if they wanted to protect your child or your grandmother's health.

Unfortunately, we know that the Black community is disproportionately impacted by environmental pollution. I have talked about what is going on in my district every single week. Black Americans are three times more likely to die of asthma after continued exposure to polluted air, a result of historic, systemic racism.

This legislation makes it virtually impossible for impacted communities to file lawsuits against corporate pol-

luters for environmental and public health damages, so it is killing your lungs and silencing your voice.

It continues to put mining rights ahead of the interests of the community, especially in indigenous communities where mining was used to settle the West. This bill declares that indigenous communities shouldn't even be consulted about what is going on on their lands, to rip away lands from indigenous communities in favor of our own traditional, patriarchal, American individualistic interests.

Even more than that, we have seen ties between environmental racism and increased rates of gender violence at these mining sites where indigenous women and girls are attacked by employees at the man camps. Now they don't even care about the safety of women and girls.

Polling shows that two-thirds of Americans want legislation that addresses the climate crisis, proving once again that Republicans answer to special interests and not the will of the people. This is all about dirty money, profits over people, and it is disgraceful.

Shame on them, Mr. Chair, for deliberately ignoring the health of our people and the environment. I oppose this bill and any other fossil fuel cash grabs the Republicans send our way.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, when I see the sign about selling out clean air, I think about the coal-powered plant per week that is being built in China so they can manufacture the minerals that we need here in America.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), the chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this energy package. I repeat, in support of this package. This crucial piece of legislation would increase domestic energy production, reform the permitting process, and reverse the Biden administration's anti-energy policies that are crushing our Nation's small oil and gas producers.

As the chairman of the Committee on Small Business, I hear from our small producers about the damage that has been done to their industry over the last few years. The Biden administration's hostile approach toward this entire industry is harming small businesses. They are simultaneously trying to deal with high inflation created by the Biden administration, supply chain issues created by the Biden administration, and an inability to access capital.

Tomorrow, my committee will examine the critical role small business plays in domestic energy production and highlight how this legislation is a step in the right direction. We should be the supplier of, not the buyer of. Let the people decide.

I applaud the Speaker and the chairman and all of my Republican colleagues that put together H.R. 1 to deliver reliable and affordable energy for the American people.

I have something to say to my friends on the other side. Profits—I repeat, profits—are good. In God we trust.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chair, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to House Republicans' polluters over people act, H.R. 1.

This dangerous bill appears to be doubling down on dirty fossil fuels to pad the profits of polluters and Big Oil. Our Republican friends seem to be oblivious to the fact that, as we speak, there are communities in this country devastated by extreme weather events, from deadly tornadoes to life-threatening atmospheric rivers to unprecedented snowfall. Instead of legislating with an eye toward the future, our colleagues across the aisle are bringing up a bill that pretends there is no climate crisis.

Scientists agree that action on climate is literally life or death. The recent IPCC report that just came out reminds us that we are out of time. It is now or never if we want to spare our kids from a future that includes more frequent and even worse extreme weather events and more climate-driven food insecurity.

The world's best climate scientists call this a climate time bomb. Our Republican colleagues call it a hoax, and they produce bills like this.

My colleagues seem to want to talk about speeding up permitting. Great, let's talk about permitting.

Democrats just secured \$1 billion for permitting streamlining in the Inflation Reduction Act for that very purpose. Let me remind you, not a single Republican voted for that bill, which was actually a solution to accelerating clean energy.

What are they trying to do instead?

They are trying to claw back the funding that we approved. They are trying to slow down permitting and do the exact opposite of what they claim that they want to see with their so-called permitting reform package.

If they want to protect this planet for future generations, then anyone who cares about that really needs to read the fine print of this bill because it would force agencies to hold oil and gas lease sales on public lands even if they are not needed. If these sales don't get enough bids, they are replaced with more sales, at lower prices. So we are not just giving away our public lands, we are doing it at laughably low prices, locking in these lands for oil and gas development for decades to come. This is not just extreme. It is obscene.

The Inflation Reduction Act included multiple oil and gas leasing reforms, modest reforms, to ensure that the public finally gets a fair share for on-shore and offshore fossil fuel development. If we are going to begin to address the impacts of the climate crisis, then ending massive fossil fuel sub-

sidies is a pretty good place to start. Under this legislation, not only are we going in the opposite direction, we are removing even these modest provisions to allow taxpayers to finally get their fair share from the incredible profits that these polluting industries would receive.

This legislation lowers royalty rates, repeals interest fees, reinstates non-competitive leasing, and it does all of this while fossil fuel companies are rolling in record profits of \$451 billion for the oil and gas industry last year.

H.R. 1 is the biggest rollback of the Clean Water Act that we have seen in 50 years. It will remove important clean water protections for States and Tribal Governments specifically. Under current law, section 401 of the Clean Water Act gives States and Tribes authority to review water quality as well as requirements of State law on any project or activity that requires a Clean Water Act permit. This bill would slash that authority and shorten the time frame for which they can review such projects.

Make no mistake, this will make it harder to protect the waterways and the communities that depend on clean water in this country. Whether you are in East Palestine or Philadelphia or anywhere else in this country, we should know better than to take something as critical as clean water for granted.

I had an amendment that would retain these section 401 protections for Tribal Governments. This was a simple test because often some of my Republican colleagues say that they believe in Tribal sovereignty and they want to empower Tribal voices. So we came up with an amendment to let them do that, to just at least take away this terrible provision when it came to Tribal Governments. They declined to move that amendment forward. It was blocked.

Why do our Republican colleagues want to block Tribal voices?

One of the last details that we should note, if you listen to the debt ceiling debate, this cyclical, situational concern for fiscal conservatism which is coming around again, my colleagues on the other side shout from the rooftops now about the deficit.

Well, guess what? This legislation is not just bad for people, not just bad for the planet, it is fiscally irresponsible. The CBO projects that it will add to the deficit.

Just a reminder, the Inflation Reduction Act, which all of my friends voted against, paid for itself and reduced the deficit.

Look, we do need to be talking about permit streamlining for clean energy infrastructure. This is very important. We need more efficient procedures to bring more renewable energy online, to modernize and upgrade electricity transmission facilities, but this bill doesn't even begin to touch any of that. That is our greatest need, and it is nowhere in this bill.

If my Republican friends want to be taken seriously regarding permitting reform and not just giveaways to polluters, they need to offer real solutions. This package is not it.

For the sake of the planet and future generations, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. There are real, workable solutions to addressing our energy needs, extreme weather, food insecurity, and all of the downstream consequences of climate change, but this bill doesn't do it.

□ 1645

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. MOYLAN).

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, a historic and consequential piece of legislation to bring down our skyrocketing energy costs and secure America's energy independence.

On my home island of Guam, energy costs have reached historical highs. Less than a year ago, gas prices reached an all-time high of \$6.49 a gallon. On average, gas prices are still 40 percent higher than they were before Biden took office.

The people of Guam can't continue to face these inflated costs. We must deliver solutions here in Washington to help ease their pain.

This administration's misguided energy policies have shackled our economy and penalized hardworking Americans. There is a misguided war on American energy, and that war needs to end now.

Let's set the record straight. Critics on the bill claim it is simply a handout to oil and gas companies. This couldn't be further from the truth.

The Lower Energy Costs Act is an all-of-the-above energy solution. This legislation streamlines regulatory burdens holding back our infrastructure projects, whether it is a natural gas pipeline or transmission lines from a solar facility—both are held back by the same.

It also contains important reforms for not only traditional types of energy but also the energy of tomorrow.

With the Lower Energy Costs Act, Republicans are delivering on one of our fundamental campaign promises—to bring gas prices down and to ease the burden on hardworking Americans. We are quite literally keeping the lights on.

Many Guam residents constantly live under the growing threat of China and North Korea. We are some, if not the only, Americans who receive warnings during Korean missile tests and whose waters are routinely invaded by Chinese vessels.

Standing up to our adversaries is what keeps America strong. Energy security is national security.

For too long, we have allowed countries like China and Russia to control energy production and dominate the critical mineral supply chain.

Securing our energy independence and critical mineral supply chain ensures that foreign adversaries can't use these resources to threaten or pressure us in the future.

This legislation will make sure that the minerals we need for the technologies of tomorrow are sourced clearly, safely, and responsibly right here at home.

America has the highest standards for workplace safety and environmental concerns, and we know the conditions in Chinese-operated mines in countries like the Congo are truly horrific.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 20 seconds to the gentleman from Guam.

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, do you want to know the best way to lower global greenhouse gases?

Produce the energy right here in America.

Do you want to know the best way to secure critical minerals while ensuring minimal impact on the environment? Mine right here in America.

Do you want to improve our national security while also giving the economy a boost? Pass the Lower Energy Costs Act today.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to ensure that the American people and every single New Mexican back home in my home State knows exactly what this bill is all about.

H.R. 1 is not a bill to cut costs and unlock American energy. H.R. 1 is a blatant giveaway of public lands, public waters, and public minerals to the highest bidder.

It guts environmental laws, it opens oil and gas leasing to mining and multinational companies, and it will send our communities and our laws back to the 19th century—the 19th century—to 1847 specifically, when we opened the West through the hardrock mining law to minerals claims and multinational corporations, who took advantage of our communities, who dumped tailings piles into our rivers and our streams, and who strip-mined sacred and ancestral lands of our indigenous communities.

That is right. This bill would take us back before the automobile was invented, before we had electricity, before women had the right to vote in this country, and before New Mexico even became a territory of the United States when our communities, lands, and waters were stripped away from them and given to the highest bidder.

So let me be clear: This legislation is not about lowering costs. It is not about lessening the burden at the pump. It is not about lowering costs for our families.

These are just talking points that have been provided by fossil fuel and mining companies and by their allies across the aisle who see the opportunity to strip away environmental regulations and vast amounts of public

resources, lands, and waters for private profit.

In fact, this bill will increase the deficit, robbing our communities of more than a century of hard-fought environmental wins to protect our lands and waters.

That is why House Democrats have a clear message today: Not on our watch.

Let's be clear and talk exactly about what this bill is and does. My friends, Mr. Chairman, on the other side of the aisle want to claim that this bill will create jobs, that more drilling and mining will lower costs, and that it is going to somehow magically solve our global critical mineral shortage.

Let me be clear, as somebody whose parents worked in the energy industry. My father was a welder in the oil and gas fields; my mother, a crane mechanic at a coal-fired power plant.

As somebody who spent over two decades of my career working on natural resources issues, let me say it loud and clear: We cannot mine and drill our way to solve these problems.

In fact, this bill not only does not help our communities but puts our Nation and our planet at risk. Scientists from across the world released a report just last week that made clear that if we do not take significant action right now to curb global emissions, we will cross a global tipping point and catastrophic global climate change.

This bill would threaten our global planetary health. In fact, this legislation, which the President has already said he would veto, would open vast swaths of our land and our water to oil and gas drilling, to mining, not to lower costs, but to line the pockets of wealthy oil companies.

In the name of streamlining, it would gut environmental laws like the National Environmental Policy Act, a piece of bipartisan legislation that Richard Nixon signed; the Clean Water Act; the Clean Air Act.

It would gut protections for our communities to be able to actually have a say in what happens in their own lands and waters. It would make it easier for large corporations to pollute and dump toxins without consequence.

Finally, this legislation not only does not lower costs but raises the deficit by billions of dollars.

So I ask the American people and I ask New Mexicans: Is this what you want Congress working on, a 175-page bill filled with thinly veiled corporate giveaways that gut our environmental laws, that cut our communities out, and that would line the pockets of private corporations?

No. The American people want clean air. They want clean water. They want climate action. They want a planet that they can leave to their children.

That is why Democrats and the President fought to pass the Inflation Reduction Act just a few months ago in this Chamber.

That bill makes the largest investment in climate action ever in the history of this country and ever in the history of this planet.

Our bill, the bill we passed to address the global climate crisis, will create millions of jobs. It will rebuild our infrastructure and our local economies.

It will invest in our communities and the resilience of our ecosystems. It will reduce household costs like our friends across the aisle are trying to claim with this giveaway bill.

Guess what? It reduces the deficit, all while putting us on a path to cutting carbon emissions in this country by 40 percent by 2030.

Guess what else happened? Not a single Republican in this Chamber voted for that bill. Not one. Not one Member on the other side of the aisle voted to lower costs, voted for a clean energy future, voted to protect the environment, voted to protect our communities.

We cannot drill and mine our way to a clean energy and climate secure future.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to pass H.R. 1.

We cannot afford to send our communities back to the 19th century. We cannot afford to let private companies deforest and strip-mine our lands.

We cannot afford to go back to a time when rivers were on fire, and companies dumped toxins into our groundwater with impunity.

That is why I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation because the path is clear. We must take climate action now and build a clean energy economy and leave a livable planet for our communities, for the future, and for our Nation.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, thanks to Democrat energy policies, Putin, Xi Jinping, and the crown prince of Saudi are the ones that are drilling and mining their way to prosperity at the expense of the American public.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, Lower Energy Costs Act, an actual solution to the problems we are facing.

We have seen what happens abroad when Nations are at the mercy of energy imports from nefarious actors. We have seen what happens at home when energy prices skyrocket and families struggle to pay for gas and groceries.

That is why I am a staunch supporter of this bill and the mission behind it. H.R. 1 is an important step toward unleashing American energy, lowering prices, and strengthening our energy supply chains.

The American government should not be in the business of picking winners and losers. We need an all-of-the-above energy approach.

Increasing production and untangling energy from overly burdensome red tape is key toward providing certainty and stability to American businesses, consumers, and families. That is why I support this bill, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MULLIN).

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act. The truth is simple. We have no time to waste in the fight against climate change.

This Republican bill would reverse years of progress, emboldening polluters and repealing critical environmental regulations, all while increasing the Federal deficit.

As a father of two young boys, I know this is not the future we want to leave for our children.

□ 1700

Instead of rewarding fossil industries with more record-shattering profits, we need to transition to a clean energy economy by expanding on Democratic wins like the Inflation Reduction Act.

In my home State of California, we have seen the dangers that a warming planet poses to our livelihoods and environment. Wildfires, sea level rise, flooding, and extreme weather patterns can be fatal to our communities.

My bayfront district is surrounded by water. Our communities are threatened by sea level rise on both sides of our peninsula. H.R. 1 would only raise this threat.

H.R. 1 would prioritize the interests of Big Oil and protect profiteers at the expense of our most vulnerable communities and ecosystems.

Critical habitats like the San Francisco Bay would suffer. I recently supported over \$75 million in bay restoration funding—natural solutions to sea level rise.

H.R. 1 would significantly harm those efforts.

The American people asked for lower costs, more jobs, and a livable future, not shameless giveaways to Big Oil, not for the polluters over people act.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT), another member of the House Natural Resources Committee

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I remind my colleagues, last night while they charged their phones, this morning when they brewed their cup of coffee, or even considered maybe putting on a mask for the third year in a row, and even this very moment as we stand in this Chamber with the lights on, the mics working, the AC turned down very, very low, for every one of these actions, they have an American energy worker to thank for it.

Instead of being grateful, Joe Biden and D.C. Democrats have waged a war on the American energy production, and the consequences have been devastating for the American people. Gas prices are up 44 percent, and instead of trying to enable moms and dads to get to and from work without breaking the bank, my Democratic colleagues are still suffering from Trump derangement syndrome. I don't know, maybe Pfizer has a vaccine for that one.

You know, in my district, we have been regulated into poverty because of Democrat policies pushing oil and gas

out of our communities. Now, moms who could have stayed home are forced to get a job to supplement the income that is lost from the good-paying job that dad no longer has. Then there are the childcare struggles that they are facing and the inflation struggles that they are facing that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, have created.

Mr. Chairman, instead of screaming: "Orange man bad" on TikTok, maybe they should come up with some real solutions because that isn't going to solve the problems that America is facing.

American Republicans are focused on delivering policy solutions to address those problems. H.R. 1 includes my bill, the American Energy Act, which will reduce gas prices by providing certainty for responsible energy production and preventing baseless litigation. After all, no one produces better, safer, cleaner energy than us right here in the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, it is past time House Democrats start to have a little empathy and dismount their moral high horse of climate change. There are thousands of children currently today slaving away in the Congo at Chinese-owned mines. They have to dig for cobalt with their bare hands. Instead of freeing these slaves and even ourselves from the need of this resource, they want to buy more Chinese-made products. It is clear they have a climate religion. They worship the Earth while I worship the creator, not the creation.

We are here to be good stewards of our land, so stop sacrificing the American families at your altar of climate change. The choice here is simple. America can continue to rely on foreign energy produced by nations that hate us—

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an 30 additional seconds.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, the choice is simple. America can continue to rely on foreign energy produced by nations that hate us and hate our values, or we can become energy independent once again.

Pursue energy dominance and put the American roughneck before OPEC, and maybe, just maybe, we put the American people before the Green New Deal lobbyists.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the passage of H.R. 1.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LIEU).

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Chairman, let me first commend Ranking Member Raul Grijalva for fighting the good fight every day.

I rise today to oppose the polluters over people act. It is an extreme MAGA Republican bill that will increase pollution by lowering environmental standards. It will increase climate

change by removing a lot of provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act designed to combat climate change. It also increases the deficit.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, it will increase the deficit by over \$2.4 billion just on one bill alone. It is like a triple threat of badness. It increases pollution, it increases global warming, and it increases the deficit.

Now, let's just take a review of what we have done up to now. Last term when Democrats were in control, we passed laws that moved the American family forward.

We passed the American Rescue Plan that got our economy back on track as we were coming out of a pandemic.

We then followed that up with the infrastructure law to rebuild roads, bridges, and highways; to take lead out of water pipes; and to put broadband everywhere from rural areas to inner cities and everywhere in between.

We then followed that up with the CHIPS and Science Act. That is going to bring manufacturing back to the United States.

Then we followed that up with the Inflation Reduction Act, which not only helped reduce the deficit—Democrats reduced the deficit by over \$1.7 trillion last year—but that Inflation Reduction Act also had the highest number of climate change projects and the highest amount of climate change funding in world history.

This term when Republicans took control, what did you all do? Well, let me tell you. You read the Constitution on the House floor. You took turns doing that. You also held not one, but two congressional hearings complaining about Twitter.

It is more than just stupid stuff. Extreme MAGA Republicans are trying to pass extreme MAGA Republican bills like H.R. 1 that is going to, again, increase climate change, increase pollution, and increase the deficit. It is also a monumental waste of time, because guess what? This bill ain't going anywhere.

It is not going to pass the Senate, because you need to override a filibuster. That ain't gonna happen.

Even if it miraculously does pass the Senate, the administration has already signaled they are going to veto it. We are just wasting time here when we should be focused on more relevant issues like how do we prevent gun violence at schools.

My heart goes out to the victims of the tragic mass shooting yesterday in Nashville. Three of the victims were 9-year-old children. Recently, a member of the Republican Caucus from Tennessee was asked what we are going to do to fix school violence.

His answer was: We are not going to fix it.

Well, Democrats have a different view. Instead of wasting time on political stunts like H.R. 1, let's pass universal background checks into law.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas has 25 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE), who knows a lot about diversified energy because Oklahoma has the most diversified energy portfolio of any State.

Mrs. BICE. Mr. Chairman, I find it disingenuous for the other side of the aisle to continue to talk about pollutants over people, and here is why:

The Democrats are the ones that are wanting to pollute our environment. They are the ones that are supporting electrification, which requires batteries and rare earth minerals. Those same rare earth minerals that go into those batteries are being mined in China or other countries across the world with no regulations. They continue to pollute the environment, so to suggest that this bill is harming the environment is just ridiculous.

Since President Biden took office, Americans have felt the pain of skyrocketing energy costs. Gas prices have reached historical highs and are still well over 40 percent of what they were when he was sworn in.

Time and again, this administration has caved to environmental justice groups and held up critical energy infrastructure projects, canceling lease sales, and weaponizing the permitting process to cater to their political agenda.

This is why the Lower Energy Costs Act is so critical. This legislation provides important safeguards to lower energy costs and help streamline the pace of projects by putting in place deadlines for filing litigation on final agency actions concerning energy and mining projects.

The Federal permitting process is one of the most lengthy, arduous constraints that can delay projects for decades. I am glad to see vital fixes in the legislation, including my bill, the BLM Mineral Spacing Act, which removes duplicative environmental reviews and the need for Federal permitting when the Federal Government has no surface rights or only a minority share in the subsurface minerals.

If the Biden administration truly wanted to lower energy costs, the President's budget wouldn't have removed intangible drilling cost deductions. If these vital provisions were eliminated, it would not only result in increased energy prices, but it would also cost the U.S. over 250,000 jobs and would have a disparate impact throughout the Nation.

I am committed to cutting bureaucratic red tape, especially for our hardworking energy producers who have dealt with the stifling regulations from the Biden administration, and H.R. 1 is the first step toward lowering energy costs.

The legislation is a commonsense, all-of-the-above approach, and promotes American energy producers.

Simply put, we need to get back to what we do best—allowing Americans, like those in my home State of Oklahoma, to power our Nation with clean, affordable, and reliable energy.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. LATURNER).

Mr. LATURNER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

For the past 2 years, the Biden administration has done everything in their power to make it harder to produce energy here in the United States. Within the first 24 hours of being sworn into office, President Biden took executive action to kill the Keystone XL Pipeline project and ban new drilling on Federal lands.

When prices began to rise because of these misguided policies, the White House sold off our emergency oil supply and looked to Iran, Venezuela, and Saudi Arabia to increase production instead of turning to energy producers right here in America.

Just a few years ago, our Nation was energy independent. Now, we are relying on our adversaries for our most critical energy resources. As a result, families across America have faced record-high prices at the pump and soaring utility costs. It is time for a new direction.

The Lower Energy Costs Act maximizes production of reliable, American-made energy by streamlining the permitting process, investing in energy infrastructure in the United States, and reversing burdensome and costly regulations put in place by the Biden administration.

President Biden's commitment to Green New Deal policies not only puts our national security at risk, but also threatens our way of life in Kansas. The energy sector in my home State employs more than 150,000 hardworking Kansans, provides more than \$3 billion in family income, and delivers over \$1.5 billion in State and local tax revenue.

This legislation will protect our energy security, grow our economy, and create good-paying jobs in our communities. House Republicans promised the American people that we would take action to put our Nation back on the path toward energy independence and lower gas and electricity prices for hardworking families.

The Lower Energy Costs Act is a crucial step in making good on that commitment, and I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

□ 1715

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the time here tonight to talk about this key issue.

I think, just as a reminder as we start, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to make this bill into something that it isn't. The at-

mosphere is made up of only 0.04 percent carbon dioxide, so the hysteria, since it is raised from 0.03 for the last couple of decades, is really misplaced as we try to have an energy source that is reasonable and secure for the American people.

The Energy Information Administration predicts a 50 percent increase in global energy consumption by the year 2050.

Currently, America is the world's leading producer of natural gas. Petroleum and other fuels remain the largest energy source for Americans, and natural gas consumption increases globally are expected, as well.

We have, over time, the reality that no matter what the U.S. is doing, the rest of the world is going to be increasing its energy consumption.

You see on top here that all the renewables are great. They are only going to remain a tiny part around the world while we are contorting our economy to try to put our own selves out of business by meeting these ridiculous goals.

We must promote more domestic energy production and open more Federal lands for exploration and drilling. H.R. 1 is a tiny piece of legislation that will do that.

Give the American people what they want. Yes, they want clean air and clean water, but they also want reasonable energy. We know how to do it cleanly and efficiently.

We must not forget that, in the clean energy conversation, America's energy is cleaner than other top producers that will keep producing, like China and Russia. American energy is clean energy.

I am glad to see this bill making the reforms that are necessary to help on energy, as well as forestry, with the burdensome NEPA process that is delaying the U.S. Forest Service doing needed thinning projects, like in my district where they have had the Camp fire that burned down most of the town of Paradise and a million-acre fire known as the Dixie fire.

NEPA reform will make it where we can save our forests, have them be cleaner, have them not put so much pollution in the air that it even reaches the East Coast with smoke plumes, and, instead, have our wood and paper products coming from our forests instead of having to import them.

It makes a heck of a lot more sense to have a process to work through NEPA and others that still is accountable ecologically but is something you can get done so you can get ahead of the curve with better forest management and energy that is cleaner and that comes from our country.

I am glad to be part of this bill. I thank the chairman for running it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN), another

member of the House Natural Resources Committee and the chairwoman of the Indian and Insular Affairs Subcommittee.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1.

America must have accessible and affordable energy. Coal, oil and gas, and uranium are three of the most important resources we have to meet our demands. These resources are needed now and will be needed for generations to come, with demand only increasing over time.

The key question that we must address, then, is who is going to be producing our energy? Our fellow Americans, using our very own resources here? Or foreign and often hostile countries?

For the Republicans, the correct answer is obvious. For the Biden administration and Democrats, however, the answer lies not in using our own abundant energy resources and controlling our own destiny but in offshoring energy and mineral production to Third World and dictatorial countries that care nothing about protecting the environment.

The Biden administration and our friends across the aisle prefer to rely on coal from China and oil and gas from Russia, Iran, Venezuela—anywhere but here.

Their preferred energy policy is one that empowers and enriches dictators, despots, and tyrants; one that destroys our access to and use of safe, clean, and reliable energy that is found right here in America; and one that is designed to increase the cost and decrease the availability of the very building blocks of a civilized society, including food, housing, concrete, fertilizer, transportation, and manufacturing.

Their preferred energy policy is one that establishes energy poverty as the cornerstone of our society, where blackouts, intermittent power, and Third World conditions define our day-to-day existence.

In reality, the Democrats are reading from a fairytale, one in which we are allegedly going to be carbon-free by 2030, or perhaps it is 2035, or maybe we should look to 2050.

The only thing that the American people need to understand is that whatever the magical year is, it is beyond a point in time when they are no longer in power.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Their promise of outlawing gas stoves, air-conditioners that work, and the internal combustion engine and other technologies that make our lives better is beyond their expiration date as politicians. How so very convenient.

The House Republicans are ready to fight for American citizens and ensure that we have clean and abundant energy, and I rise in support of and support H.R. 1.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), another member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, it was just this morning we were having a hearing and talking about Biden's bloated \$1.2 trillion infrastructure Green New Deal. One-third of that act went to actual infrastructure projects, and it looks like they are in trouble now because of inflation.

It is one of the main reasons I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Over the past 2 years under the Biden administration, we have seen gas prices that are up nearly a dollar after hitting a historic high of \$5 per gallon last summer. With energy demand only increasing, we can't afford the Biden administration's anti-energy agenda hitting our pocketbooks any harder.

This crucial piece of legislation will finally end the Biden administration's war on American energy production by prohibiting President Biden from banning fracking, repealing restrictions on the import and export of natural gas, and stopping Biden's \$6 billion natural gas tax.

This bill will also incentivize domestic mineral production to ensure the U.S. has the resources necessary to compete with China.

We will reform the National Environmental Policy Act to modernize and shorten the Federal regulatory process that takes years to get through. The days of projects taking decades to get off the ground are over. In the U.S., it can take more than 10 years to get a permit to mine, while our neighbors, our competitors, are much faster, further incentivizing our companies to export mineral production.

That changes today when we reopen the cleanest energy in the world, American-made energy.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, may I inquire again as to the time left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DUARTE), another member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. DUARTE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1.

We hear today that it is not very interesting to discuss the Constitution to some. Well, let's see the Constitution in operation today.

We are the champions of abundance over here, and we want to show the American people, the working families

in America, what an abundance agenda looks like and show them our commitment to improving their lives with abundance.

We stand here arguing, in my opinion, with the lords of scarcity. They want to protect our forests until our forests burn. They want to leave American oil in the ground while gas prices go up for American working families, while energy costs in my district in California go over 25 cents a kilowatt, where working families in my district open the screen door in 105-degree temperatures because they can't afford to run their air-conditioners.

Yet, the lords of scarcity think we need more solar panels on more high-income homes, getting off the grid, leaving the cost of delivering electricity to the working families in America.

When we drill it in America, when we dam it in America, when we nuke it in America, when we frack it in America, we save American jobs and increase American families' affordability.

When we grow it in America, when we log it in America, when we make it in America, we create jobs and create affordability, and we do it more sustainably than anywhere else on Earth.

Over here, we are the champions of abundance, and we are here today to tell the American working family that there is a better choice for them. We can thrive. We can have affordability. We can have sustainability. We can have opportunity right here in America.

With H.R. 1, drill oil now, we can deliver American working families a better option.

Please keep talking about how silly you think the Constitution is. It is in play right now.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), the chair of the Congressional Western Caucus.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to talk about something that affects every single person, not only in this room but in our entire country. You need it to turn on the lights. You need it to drive your car. For my folks back home in central Washington, it is how you run your farm, your business, and your home.

Recently, the cost of that energy has gone through the roof. For years now, the Biden administration has been telling the Nation that global markets are complex and that there are dynamics that are out of our control that contributed to the highest gas prices since 2008 and spiking global oil prices.

We know better. This administration has effectively shut down all future energy and resource development, has created one of the most hostile environments for energy and resource producers, and continues to take actions

every single day to further their Green New Deal agenda. They should absolutely be held responsible for the burden now placed on the American people, who are struggling to make ends meet.

While it is very clear to me, just as I know it is clear to my constituents, that President Biden and this administration are failing to display the leadership America needs and deserves, there is a silver lining here. That is H.R. 1.

The Lower Energy Costs Act will finally get government out of the way of the American people. It will put an end to serial litigants stopping energy projects. It will cut through the endless red tape our producers face. It will unleash American energy to lower the cost for every American.

This is what we need, and it is what the American people deserve.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. EZELL).

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

For the last 2 years, the Biden administration has implemented radical energy policies that have caused the price of gas and other household expenses to skyrocket. At the same time, this administration has forced us to become more dependent on hostile foreign nations and has caused us to lose high-paying American energy jobs.

H.R. 1 is commonsense legislation that addresses these problems. It would increase domestic energy production, reform outdated permitting processes, and support the production and processing of critical minerals.

Ultimately, this bill works to support the energy needs of hardworking American families who are struggling with the high prices created by this administration's policies.

As a member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I am proud of the way H.R. 1 improves water quality certification by streamlining an outdated permitting process. Bureaucrats often weaponize the process by slowing down certification for projects that don't fit their radical agenda.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I spent 6 years as a State energy regulator, and our focus was always on safe, affordable, reliable energy because we knew that that could power American prosperity.

Indeed, this abundance of American energy that we have been talking about can be a huge American competitive advantage in an increasingly uncertain world. Unfortunately, we have

made it so difficult to do big projects in this country anymore.

If you need a strong piece of evidence, look at President Biden's unilateral canceling of the Keystone XL pipeline. Unfortunately, that is not the only piece of evidence.

□ 1730

It takes 5 to 7 years to permit an energy project in this country. It is an almost uniquely American problem. That same energy project could get permitted in less than half the time in countries like Canada and Australia.

H.R. 1, Mr. Chairman, is a huge step in the right direction. It prevents the constant relitigation of projects and of reviews that have already been settled. It moves the NEPA process into the 21st century by making sure that we have got an online permitting portal for projects. It creates deadlines for NEPA and other environmental reviews. Imagine that, a shot clock, a deadline, to make sure the government's work is done on time. Then, Mr. Chairman, it unlocks American energy by allowing the Department of the Interior to resume energy leasing and to repeal restrictions on the export and import of natural gas.

Mr. Chair, the abundance of American energy is a huge American competitive advantage. H.R. 1 makes that so.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA).

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Chair, in 2019, the United States became energy independent for the first time in 62 years. However, on his first day in office, President Biden destroyed American energy production by killing the Keystone XL pipeline and outsourcing our energy needs to our enemies.

President Biden's energy policies not only hurt our families at the pump, but they also threaten our national security. That is why I have introduced an amendment to H.R. 1, my Defend America's Rural Energy Act, to defend our farmers and energy producers from foreign adversary land grabs. My amendment would specifically prohibit China from buying farmland suitable for ethanol and biodiesel production, which is vital to the rural American economy.

Honoring our Commitment to America, Republicans will end Biden's war on American energy and fulfill another promise to the American people, and that is keeping American land in the hands of the American farmer.

Mr. Chair, I am a passionate supporter of H.R. 1.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN).

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Chair, the question is: Is America's economy on the right track?

Eighty percent of Americans believe we are headed in the wrong direction.

In just 2 years, we have gone from being the world's leading energy ex-

porter to a dependent energy importer. Since January 2021, electricity is up 24 percent and gasoline is up 51 percent.

Mr. Chair, it doesn't have to be this way. The United States has the resources, the know-how, and expertise to be, once again, an energy independent nation and an exporter of energy. American energy is not the enemy; it is the solution.

H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, is how we get America back on track. For too long, Mr. Chair, we have handcuffed ourselves when it comes to our oil and natural gas potential. I stand before you committed to unleash America's energy independence but also to unleash America's energy dominance.

Mr. Chair, a "yes" vote for H.R. 1 does just that.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, a commonsense piece of legislation that will provide the American people the relief they need from Biden's war on American energy.

As someone who grew up in the West Texas oilfields, I know firsthand how vital energy production is to our national security, and I know that energy security is national security.

Under President Trump's leadership, America reached energy independence. Gas prices were low, the economy was thriving, and the world saw America as not only an energy leader but also as an economic and military force that must be taken seriously.

However, the Biden administration has taken a drastically different approach. In the first few weeks in office, Biden waged war on American energy. Biden's assault on America's energy independence has eliminated thousands of American jobs, raised the cost of domestic energy, and left the United States dangerously dependent on foreign energy sources.

Americans are struggling to pay their utility bills and gas prices are at record highs, yet this administration continues to do nothing but make matters worse.

This legislation will not only alleviate burdensome energy costs for my constituents in Texas 13 but will do so for all Americans.

Mr. Chair, I am proud to support this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this critical piece of legislation.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN).

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

H.R. 1 will unleash domestic energy production and reverse the Biden-led Democrat assault on American energy.

Democrat punitive policies have led to record-high gas prices, limited supply, and unrelenting inflation. Folks back home in Michigan are yearning for leadership that has been sorely

lacking in Washington these past couple of years.

H.R. 1 will streamline permitting, open up new markets to export natural gas, and repeal billions in inflationary Green New Deal giveaways. H.R. 1 will also protect the land we live on, the water we drink, and the air we breathe.

Of great importance to me and my constituents is the provision continuing the longstanding ban on drilling in our Great Lakes. As the Representative for the district with the longest shoreline in the lower 48 States, including three of the five Great Lakes, I will continue to fight and defend our Great Lakes for future generations.

As we talk energy, I live in the middle of copper country. As this board shows, we need to control for our future the precious metals necessary for what we do.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Chair, I thank my Democrat colleagues for their comments, both from the Committee on Natural Resources members and other colleagues that came forth to speak against the polluters over people act, H.R. 1.

Republican Members have produced an extreme piece of legislation. As I listened to the rationale today, there were four or five things that were repeated over and over again. It is an extreme piece and a high cost to pay for a speakership, but nevertheless, the rationale today was, as I heard it, patriotism. If you vote "no" for H.R. 1, you don't believe in America and you are not a patriot; you support China, Russia, Venezuela, OPEC, and communism. Unfortunately, that is a desperate lie and unnecessary in this debate.

The other rationale I heard: Let the polluters drive energy policy, production, and the safeguards that the American people need. That was one of the rationales.

The other one that struck me is collateral damage. Tribes, poor people, 40 million Americans, communities of color, once again, they get thrown under the bus to satisfy the greed of polluters.

The issues of environmental justice are almost eliminated and downplayed in this whole discussion. That is 40 million people. That is collateral damage that cannot be tolerated and should not be.

You ignore climate change. You blame other nations and ask Americans to accept a lower bar for themselves and give up the opportunity, as we always have, to historically lead in this world of ours.

This act is about taxpayer subsidies to a powerful and rich polluter industry that doesn't need the support. It dismantles fundamental public health, clean air, clean water, NEPA, environmental protections, and judicial review.

We need to remember that this act, H.R. 1, polluters over people, deals with

a very consequential issue, and that is the consequential issue of life. H.R. 1 is dangerous to life. The real true act of patriotism, I remind my colleagues, is our responsibility and our oath to protect lives, to extend the future, to deal with fairness and the public's right to know and the public to have a voice in their future. H.R. 1, the polluters over people act, undoes all of that.

Do we want to go back to the good old days when the rivers were burning, we were clear-cutting forests, when it was all right to admit wrongdoing and not have any consequences?

Those are not the good old days that people want to go back to.

If we are going to deal with the climate challenge and the climate action that is needed in this crisis, H.R. 1 needs to be defeated. It is the right thing to do, it is the American thing to do, and it is the patriotic thing to do.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 1 is dangerous and needs to be defeated. I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

It is a time for choosing. It is a time to choose whether you want to be with America or if you want to be continually supporting our adversaries across the seas.

H.R. 1 provides a solution to a problem that Democrat energy policy has created. Democrat energy policy means energy dependence.

H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, means energy independence for America.

Democrat energy policy is a threat to national security.

H.R. 1 secures our country, secures our country's energy, secures our country's minerals, secures our country's food supply, and secures our country's future as we move forward.

Democrat energy policy is bogged down with their very permitting processes.

H.R. 1 will relieve those permitting processes. It doesn't undermine any bedrock environmental laws. It actually makes the environmental laws work. It allows projects to be permitted. Green energy projects, American energy projects, roads, bridges, transportation corridors, ports, navigable waterways, all of those things are being held up by the permitting process. H.R. 1 will be a great step toward making things happen in America.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1, to lower energy costs for Americans, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair now recognizes the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for 1 hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member or their designees.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, which will unlock United States energy potential, benefiting Missourians and Americans nationwide.

Broadly speaking, this bill is important for so many reasons, from increasing domestic energy production to encouraging the production of critical minerals to modernizing the NEPA process for energy and other infrastructure projects. This bill does exactly what the title says.

Division C of the bill was produced by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and it focuses on streamlining and clarifying the scope of section 401 of the Clean Water Act to prevent its continued abuse in blocking energy infrastructure projects.

Many projects that require water quality certifications under section 401 are critical to our Nation's energy production, such as natural gas pipelines, LNG, and coal export terminals.

Division C of the bill makes clear that States cannot block important energy projects on grounds outside of the Clean Water Act quality standards, consistent with the intent of the original law.

Last month, H.R. 1152, which is encompassed within division C, was marked up and passed out of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

□ 1745

As included in H.R. 1, division C is incredibly important to lowering energy costs and boosting energy production while still ensuring water quality.

Mr. Chair, I thank two of my subcommittee chairmen, DAVID ROUZER and GARRET GRAVES, for their leadership in sponsoring this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chair, I would urge support of the bill. By passing H.R. 1, the House would support moving critical energy projects forward and support lowering costs for Americans through greater energy independence.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of clean water and in support of the Clean Water Act, and in opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

Clean water is a basic human right—the health and safety of our communities and the success of our economy depends on it. House Democrats stand for clean water.

Last Congress, we passed a historic and bipartisan investment in our Nation's infrastructure through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. The BIL included almost \$13 billion in clean water infrastructure upgrades and is creating jobs in communities across the country.

The Clean Water Act, passed in 1972, is one of the most successful environmental laws in our Nation's history. It

has protected rivers, lakes, and streams from pollution and contamination, ensuring that we have access to clean and safe water.

Section 401 of the Clean Water Act allows States to review projects that could impact their water quality. For 50 years, States have used this authority to protect their water resources, and it has helped them ensure that projects move forward only if clean water would not be compromised as a result.

These proposals that are in H.R. 1, to narrow the scope of section 401, are a misguided effort at permitting reform. By limiting the ability of States to review projects, we are sacrificing the health of our communities and our environment for the sake of expedience and profit.

I recognize the majority's interest in ensuring that permitting requirements are not insurmountable barriers to investment. I share the goal of speeding up project delivery.

Last Congress, I supported not only the BIL, but also the CHIPS Act and the Inflation Reduction Act. These laws showed what Congress is capable of when it focuses on addressing the real needs of American families. I want these laws and their investments to be successful.

However, to quickly put these investments to work, we need a robust partnership between the Federal Government and its State and local partners and Tribal partners, to address State, local, and Tribal requirements, and to ensure community buy-in before these investments are implemented.

To be effective, that process must build on a mutual trust between the parties because any effort to force that process often results in opposition, delay, and litigation.

Yet, H.R. 1 misses the mark by stifling local participation and buy-in, which will only result in these projects taking longer to implement.

In fact, State organizations, such as the Western States Water Council, believe that placing arbitrary and strict limits on section 401 application review times and processes will require the States "to issue an increased number of denials, due to inflexible deadlines that do not accommodate State public engagement laws or allow sufficient time to gather adequate information on project impacts."

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 1, and reject the efforts to weaken the Clean Water Act and our Nation's other bedrock environmental laws. We must protect our water resources for future generations and for the health of today's communities and families.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1, to

lower energy costs. United States energy independence is critical to meeting domestic demand, and growing needs from the rest of the world.

Rather than pulling out all of the stops to keep domestic production moving forward to meet this increased demand, the Biden administration has instead begged the OPEC cartel to boost their output, culminating in a failed appeal from President Biden to the Saudi Crown Prince in July of last year. To me, this is exactly why we are here in support of H.R. 1 today.

As a result of the historic increases in inflation under the Biden administration, the average American family is spending an extra \$395 to purchase the same monthly necessities as they did a year ago.

In November 2022, one in six families were behind on utility bills, and we are not out of the woods yet as natural gas prices rose over 14 percent just last month. This is especially concerning as 47 percent of U.S. households use natural gas to heat their homes.

The Lower Energy Costs Act seeks to reverse the troubling energy policy strategy that the Biden administration has carried out, and it prioritizes American energy dominance ahead of misguided Green New Deal-style policies.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote on the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1, particularly division C, which was introduced in the House as H.R. 1152, and was marked up by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with strong opposition from my Democratic colleagues. The polluters over the people act let polluters off the hook for harmful actions and damaging impacts to our rivers, lakes, and our streams that our local communities rely on for clean, safe drinking water.

Division C is an attack on section 401 of the Clean Water Act, which is a key mechanism for States and Tribes to evaluate projects that cross within their borders and have an impact on their waters and environment for decades.

Section 401 has been a successful example of cooperative federalism, while preserving State authority to manage their natural resources. Section 401 has been a well-supported, effective tool since the beginning of the Clean Water Act, but the Trump administration found a way to make it a scapegoat for the failure of senseless and harmfully polluting mega-projects.

The provisions in the polluters over people act will tie the hands of States and Tribes seeking to preserve stream flow for their water supplies, to prevent runoff and water pollution, and to minimize impacts to flood-preventing wetlands. It goes against the Clean Water Act's rights of States to prevent, reduce, and eliminate pollution.

First, in California, this bill would have huge impacts. For one, limiting analysis to only discharges would mean the State would be unable to consider the impact of the whole project, such as increasing impervious surfaces, or considering downstream effects. Our State is trying to preserve every drop of water we can get. Yet, this bill would stop my State from protecting its water supply from the adverse impacts of projects pursued by out-of-State interests.

Second, this bill places arbitrary, and likely impossible timelines on the States to act on permit requests. Despite how complicated or huge the project might be, this bill will severely limit the time allowed for a State to review its impact. My friends across the aisle may not realize this, but this bill may lead to greater numbers of project rejections as the State is pressured to respond without the time to fully analyze the project.

This bill is another attempt to gut—really gut—the Clean Water Act and allow pollution and industry to act without repercussion. We must defend human health, our economy, and the natural environment, and oppose the damaging bill that will harm local communities.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from the State of California, State of Washington, and the State of New York in strong opposition to H.R. 1152, which is the bill that became division C, H.R. 1.

FEBRUARY 28, 2023.

Hon. CHAIRMAN GRAVES,
Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRAVES: As the water quality certifying agencies for California, New York, and Washington, we write to underscore the importance of existing law in protecting state waters from water pollution associated with federally licensed projects. On February 24, 2023, Representatives Rouzer and Graves introduced H.R. 1152—Water Quality Certification and Energy Project Improvement Act of 2023, to amend section 401 of the Clean Water Act that would, among other things, revise section 401 to: (1) reduce the scope of states' and tribes' 401 water quality certification authority to apply only to the discharge to a water of the United States, rather than the whole of the activity; (2) narrow states' and tribes' section 401 water quality certification authority to exclude much of what is required to comply with water quality standards and implementation plans under section 303 of the Clean Water Act; (3) remove the states' and tribes' authority to ensure compliance with "other appropriate requirement[s] of State law"; (4) replace references to an "application" for certification with a "request" for certification; and (5) impose a time requirement on states and tribes to identify information needed before taking an action on a certification request, (6) make other changes to the law that introduce substantial uncertainty about the scope of section 401 for project proponents and state and tribes. Each of these changes would undermine states' abilities to protect water quality within their states and erode five decades of successful, cooperative federalism. We ask that Congress preserve the existing state authority in the Clean Water Act to substantively review a project's effects on water quality before a federal permit or license is issued.

Background

Under section 401 of the Clean Water Act, a federal agency may not issue a permit or license to conduct any activity that may result in any discharge into waters of the United States unless a section 401 water quality certification is issued, or certification is waived. The State Water Resources Control Board ("State Water Board") and the nine California Regional Water Quality Control Boards (collectively, "Water Boards"), [NY Signatory], [WA Signatory] are certifying agencies pursuant to section 401 of the Clean Water Act. In all three states, the most common federal licenses subject to section 401 are Clean Water Act section 404 dredge or fill permits issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and licenses for hydropower facilities issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

During the five decades since Congress enacted section 401 in the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970, state water quality agencies diligently processed thousands of section 401 requests each year with little controversy. The vast majority of section 401 certifications were issued promptly and most section 401 certifications were granted, with only a handful of denials issued each year. Beginning around 2016, prompted by a handful of high-profile section 401 denials, some project applicants and industry lobbyists began claiming that states were "abusing" their section 401 authority. Such claims of abuse are not, and never have been, true. In the handful of cases when project applicants have alleged improper certification decisions or delay by state agencies, they have been fully capable of protecting their rights under section 401 through the traditional framework of administrative and judicial review.

Section 401 is a cornerstone of the cooperative federalism principles enshrined by the Clean Water Act

Cooperative federalism is a foundational component of the Clean Water Act. As set forth in Clean Water Act section 101 (b), "[i]t is the policy of the Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of States to prevent, reduce, and eliminate pollution" and "to plan the development and use . . . of land and water resources." Section 510 further specifies that except as expressly provided, nothing in the Clean Water Act shall preclude or deny the right of any State to adopt or enforce any standard or limitation respecting discharges of pollutants or any requirement respecting control or abatement of pollution.

The section 401 certification program is an embodiment of these cooperative federalism principles. A state certification is the mechanism of ensuring that a federal license or permit is not used as an excuse to violate state or federal water quality standards. As currently written, the language in section 401 acknowledges that states are in the best position to understand their own laws and that additional conditions may be necessary to ensure compliance with state law and applicable Clean Water Act requirements. As the federal permitting or licensing agency is often not an agency primarily tasked with managing environmental issues, the federal agency may in fact be reliant on the certification authority's expertise regarding water quality. To prevent a section 401 certification from becoming a rubber stamp, any revision to the section 401 language must preserve an expansive view of the cooperative federalism principles originally envisioned by the Clean Water Act and repeatedly affirmed by the Supreme Court. *PUD No. 1 of Jefferson Cnty. v. Washington Dep't of Ecology*, 511 U.S. 700 (1994); *S.D. Warren Co. v. Maine Bd. of Env't Prot.*, 547 U.S. 370 (2006).

The Clean Water Act should continue to protect the whole range of water quality effects resulting from the proposed activity

We strongly support the existing statutory language, which gives states and tribes the authority to regulate the potentially water-polluting activity as a whole, rather than being limited to a strict interpretation of effects from only the discharge, because regulation of the activity as a whole protects waters from the widest range of impacts. States should be able to protect water quality regardless of whether the pollution or other water quality impacts would be specifically attributable to a discharge or from some other aspect of the activity being permitted. States should be able to use the certification process to address impacts to groundwater, impacts to isolated surface waters, or impacts from non-point sources, all of which are likely not directly attributable to the discharge to a water of the United States, because these are water quality impacts that would not occur without issuance of the federal permit or license.

The problems with limiting certifications to the discharge rather than the whole of the activity would be particularly impactful on the states' ability to protect water quality during the decades long term of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") licenses in the hydropower licensing context. States and tribes must be able to fully address the water quality impacts of such activities as a whole during the 30- to 50-year term of the FERC license to reduce water quality impacts that, depending on the circumstances, may not be attributable to a point-source discharge, but result from the activity's construction, operations, and facilities. Common water quality impacts associated with hydropower activities include changes in turbidity, sediment, siltation, temperature, habitat loss, alterations to stream geomorphology, dissolved oxygen, algal productivity and algal-produced toxins, erosion, barriers to fish passage, alterations to stream geomorphology, and reductions in stream flow. Each of these impacts can have profound, generational impacts on the state's water resources.

To prevent or minimize these potential impacts, states have imposed, or considered the need for certification conditions to protect water quality on project activities that fall outside the typical understanding of point-source discharges, such as requirements for minimum instream flows and ramping rates; temperature management; aquatic invasive species management; plans for gravel replenishment, large woody material placement and other habitat measures; reservoir operation plans; erosion and sediment management plans; and monitoring and management of dissolved oxygen, mercury, pesticides, and other constituents of concerns. Previously issued certifications have typically included management, monitoring, and reporting measures to ensure compliance with water quality measures and to identify potential modifications if circumstances change. Revising the statutory language to contradict longstanding interpretations would introduce confusion and invite arguments about the nexus between the discharge and the impact, when a state or tribe's focus should more appropriately be on all water quality impacts resulting from the project. Introducing the concept of whether the activity will "directly result" in a discharge in subsection (a)(1) and (a)(4) would inject additional uncertainty and potentially further limit the certifying authority's ability to protect water quality.

Although the states would rely on their state authority to continue to preserve robust protection of water quality whenever

possible, state authority would not be an available remedy where state law is preempted by federal law. Because the Federal Power Act preempts the field of hydropower regulation absent an express exception to preemption, and FERC project licenses are valid for a fixed period of up to 50 years, water quality certifications for FERC license applications provide the states with a singular opportunity to ensure compliance with the state's water quality standards and other requirements. If the states' ability to regulate FERC licensed projects to the same extent that it has been able to for decades is significantly weakened, other, non-FERC projects would be subject to more stringent requirements to compensate for the failure of FERC-licensed projects to contribute what would otherwise be their allocated responsibility.

The Clean Water Act should continue to authorize certifications to implement water quality standards and implementation plans adopted or approved under section 303 of the Clean Water Act

Under section 401 of the Clean Water Act a water quality certification implements the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306 and 307 of the Clean Water Act and any other appropriate requirement of state law. The most important of the enumerated provisions of the Clean Water Act is section 303, which provides for water quality standards and implementation plans. Section 303 requires development and approval of water quality standards, which consist of designated uses, criteria, and anti-degradation policies; establishment of total maximum daily loads, which allocate responsibility for meeting standards that cannot be met solely through compliance with the technology-based requirements of the Clean Water Act; and implementation of a continuing planning process.

In 1994, the Supreme Court upheld state authority to set conditions of certification to protect uses designated as part of the water quality standards under section 303. *PUD No. 1*, 511 U.S. at 700. The Court rejected an argument that certification is limited to implementing the criteria component of those standards. Consistent with the Supreme Court's ruling, states have made effective use water quality certification authority to protect water quality needed for commercial, tribal, and recreational fisheries and other important uses of state waters.

The proposed revision to limit "applicable provisions" of section 303 to "requirement of state law implementing water quality criteria under section 303 necessary to support the designated use or uses of the receiving navigable waters" could strip the states' authority to use their certification authority to protect the uses of waters of the United States designated as part of water quality standards under section 303. By inexplicably omitting any reference to federal requirements that implement section 303, it would also create substantial uncertainty about states' and tribes' ability to enforce water quality criteria, total maximum daily loads, and antidegradation requirements adopted by U.S. EPA.

Congress should not remove the states' authority to require compliance with state water quality requirements

We strongly oppose the bill's proposed revisions that would limit the certifying authority to ensuring compliance with only specific sections of the Clean Water Act by deleting the existing reference to "any other appropriate requirement of State law" set forth in section 401 subsection (d). Such a revision would disregard a state's right to impose more stringent water quality requirements and be contrary to the protective goals of

the Clean Water Act. As is accounted for and endorsed by the Clean Water Act, many states have state-based programs and attendant requirements that arguably or explicitly expand beyond the state's Clean Water Act authorities. The Clean Water Act expressly contemplated a state's authority to establish and enforce more stringent state requirements beyond the Clean Water Act. For example, certifications may include monitoring and reporting requirements that arguably go beyond ensuring compliance with specific sections of the Clean Water Act, and instead help determine whether water quality is being degraded or to shape the development of future actions to protect water quality.

We urge Congress to refrain from making an unwarranted intrusion into a state's authority to impose stricter conditions to protect the quality of waters within its borders. *Section 401 should preserve the certifying authority's ability to define the contents of a request for certification and create submission procedures*

The bill proposes revising references to "application" to be "request." Although the intention behind that revision is not clear, we support language that recognizes that the certifying authority may define the contents of a request for certification and create submission procedures. The state's ability to define what is required for a request for certification is significant because a receipt of such a request is the trigger for the beginning of the reasonable period of time for a certifying authority to act on the request. The bill proposes an addition requiring certifying authorities to "publish requirements for certification," but it is not clear whether this language is an indirect reference to a certifying authority's ability to define required information for applications and submission procedures. To the extent that "requirements" were intended to require the enactment of new state regulations, 30 days is insufficient time to comply with public notice and comment requirements for State Water Board adoption.

Section 401 should not impose an arbitrary time limit on the certifying authority's ability to request information

The bill proposes revisions to subsection (a)(1) that specify that by 90 days after request for a certification, the certifying authority must inform the applicant if any additional information is necessary for the certification authority to take an action on the request. As explained above, to the extent that the language requires the certifying authority to identify what, if any, information is necessary to submit a complete application for water quality certification, many state laws, including California's, do this. But the revised language may be construed as preventing the states from requesting that the applicant clarify, amplify, correct, or supplement information required in the application, which is permissible under state law.

For these reasons, we write to ask that Congress preserve the existing state authority in Clean Water Act Section 401 to substantively review a project's effects on water quality before a federal permit or license is issued, and protect five decades of successful, cooperative federalism.

Sincerely,

EILEEN SOBECK,
Executive Director,
California State
Water Resources
Control Board.

BASIL SEGOS,
Commissioner,
New York State Department of Environ-

mental Conserva-
tion.

LAURA WATSON,
Director, Washington
State Department of
Ecology.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. In this letter, the States highlight how this legislation will undermine States' ability to protect water quality within their States, and erode five decades of successful, cooperative federalism.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose H.R. 1, the polluters over people act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT), a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the work that the chairman and the committee have done on this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to talk about why we need H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act. I can't think of anybody in this country, especially working folks, especially the people in the Second Congressional District, who I represent, that say to me: TIM, I need to pay more for my energy. They don't. They say: My energy costs are out of sight. We have to feed our kids. We have to buy books for school. We have to buy clothing for our kids. We can't afford these higher energy costs.

The Biden administration, unfortunately, and the Democrats in Congress keep pushing these Green New Deal-style agendas. Honestly, Mr. Chair, they just don't work. There hasn't been a new development in solar in over 20 years, and windmills are just what they are. The wind doesn't always blow and the sun doesn't always shine in east Tennessee, and I am sure that is the way it is across this great Nation. It is costing Americans way too much.

We are done with all this nonsense, Mr. Chair. H.R. 1 is going to end restrictions on importing and exporting natural gas. What could be wrong with that?

Why in the world are we doing business with our enemies, the people we continue to send money to? We have hundreds of years, by recent estimates, of gas in the ground that we could be getting out using safe and environmentally sound methods.

The burning apparatus now is so much safer than when this was first started, it is ridiculous. We need to fix this permitting process. We keep saying—and I have heard the White House say many times through their spokesperson—that we are permitting all these wells. Well, they don't permit the pipeline to get there. It is like we have a gallon of fuel in the ground and we are trying to pull it out with something about as big around as a needle point.

We have to process our energy projects so they can get off the ground in a reasonable amount of time. By the time we get to the end of it, the cost is

so high that it is very cost-prohibitive. We have to make the Biden administration resume the lease on most of our Federal lands and waters that they have restricted.

We have to roll back President Biden's \$27 billion slush fund for these Democrat special interest groups and these projects that amount to nothing but woke policy changes.

We have to stop the liberal States from abusing section 401 of the Clean Water Act, which they use to add a bunch of unnecessary red tape to every project they don't like. It seems like when we find a good resource, they put these barriers in place. It is just not right.

Mr. Chair, we need to focus on keeping Americans' homes heated and their lights on. Nothing should be more important, especially since we are forced to purchase it from our enemies overseas—the people that hate our guts. They love our dollars. We pay them and the next thing you know, they are burning our flag. They are saying things about us that aren't true. They are causing us all kinds of problems.

The best energy solution, Mr. Chair, above all, is the solution that we need oil, gas, and nuclear energy—like they are working on at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. It is not in the district that I represent, but it backs up to where I am. There are over 6,000 people who work there that live in my district. It is also home to Big Ed's Pizza, which is a wonderful place—I will just throw that in.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 1 is going to spur energy innovation at home, and I am proud to support it. I appreciate the great work that has been done on this issue.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), one more person who appreciates the most important natural resource we have, and that is our clean water.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, the so-called "Lower Energy Costs Act" is an attempt by the majority to strip environmental protections fought for by Congress over decades. The current leadership wishes to allow broad polluting, strip limitations on greenhouse gas emissions, and remove provisions of the Clean Water Act that not only protect our Nation's waters, but also affect the clean drinking water of everyday Americans.

Division C, the Water Quality Certification and Energy Project Improvement Act, will neither improve energy projects nor streamline the water quality certification process.

□ 1800

This section guts the Clean Water Act section 401 authority. The previous administration tried to significantly limit this authority in the interest of preventing oversight and accountability for those who polluted water sources. Now the majority is, again, attempting to gut this critical protection

authority in favor of unclear, imprecise, and irresponsible policy, which would allow significant increases in water pollution without holding polluters accountable.

This issue is particularly important to the District of Columbia because we are entirely reliant on the Potomac River for our drinking water. Under this bill, the headwaters of the Potomac River can be freely polluted in West Virginia, jeopardizing the water source of most of Northern Virginia, all of D.C., and much of southern Maryland.

We are no strangers to this kind of pollution. Before the Clean Water Act, the Potomac River was rife with agricultural runoff, trash, and other pollution. But today it is a much cleaner and healthier river and used for all manner of recreational activities. This bill would jeopardize all the progress we have made for the entire Potomac River ecosystem.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Under this bill, a project could threaten water quality, water supply, fish populations, or many other things, and D.C. and other jurisdictions would not get any say in preventing it. Polluters can act freely and to the extreme detriment of their neighbors downstream, affecting the accessibility of clean water.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEMER), who is a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Lower Energy Costs Act, a comprehensive and commonsense proposal that would lower costs for Oregon families by unleashing American energy.

The Lower Energy Costs Act paves the way for projects that would directly benefit Oregon.

H.R. 1 would prevent the environmental permitting process for critical minerals, making it more efficient for Oregon businesses to manufacture scarce and valuable products like semiconductors.

From the smartphone in your pocket, Mr. Chairman, to batteries needed for storing renewable energy, it is unacceptable that the United States is currently so reliant on China for critical products. The pragmatic permitting changes in this bill protect our national security by reducing our reliance on the Chinese Communist Party.

These changes also create opportunities for public-private partnerships on energy construction projects.

Instead of doing business with China, H.R. 1 presents an opportunity for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to

support good-paying union jobs right here at home.

The Lower Energy Costs Act would streamline initiatives like the Jordan Cove energy project, which would have been a \$10 billion investment in a natural gas project in Oregon.

As we work toward a carbon-neutral future, we must also recognize that the United States produces cleaner energy than any other country, including natural gas. A Department of Energy report found that natural gas produced in America is 40 percent cleaner than natural gas produced in Russia.

Energy prices and the cost of living have remained elevated for far too long.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1, which would help restore our energy independence, support jobs, and lower costs for hardworking families.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose H.R. 1. H.R. 1 reverses our hard-fought progress for clean water, and it also severely undermines States' abilities to protect water quality under the Clean Water Act. Under this bill, States like California would have their hands tied in their efforts to maintain water quality for drinking, recreation, and protecting our natural environments.

California has always been a leader in clean water issues, and this bill is a direct assault on our efforts to counteract pollution and protect both public health and the health of the environment.

What is more, H.R. 1 will dangerously limit States from protecting their own natural resources and bodies of water. It will limit California's efforts to conserve water, which is especially important given the extreme drought that we were in and will continue to see in the face of changing climate.

Maintaining section 401 of the Clean Water Act is vital. My friends on the other side of the aisle claim the proposed changes in the bill will prevent States from hijacking the permitting process and preventing important energy projects. However, in the past 50 years, California State water agencies have processed thousands of section 401 permit requests without issue. Only a handful each year are denied. The States have utilized this section to rightfully protect against violations of their own State water quality standards.

We see this legislation for what it truly is: a giveaway to corporate polluters at the expense of our environment.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this bill and the larger movement it stands for. We cannot and should not roll back these bedrock environmental laws.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), who is the chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, SAM GRAVES, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, let me describe the situation that we are facing right now. The Clean Water Act, as has been noted, was enacted decades and decades ago. There haven't been changes that altered the way that States are able to grant water certification under section 401 of the Clean Water Act. There have been no changes that have altered the way that this act takes place.

Yet, in recent history, States have begun using the Clean Water Act in its 401 water certification section in a way that simply weaponizes it. The States' decisions in many cases to object to projects being built in their States have nothing to do with water certification.

I can cite example after example, including by some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, who may be in the Chamber, where their States have objected to pipelines on grounds that, again, have nothing to do with clean water. This is a weaponization that has occurred in just recent history.

All the amendment does that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER) led in this case is it simply ensures that the interpretation of the Clean Water Act is consistent with congressional intent when this was implemented decades ago.

Mr. Chairman, let me give you a practical effect of how this has impacted communities and how it has impacted American citizens.

Years ago, they had a cold winter. It was a very cold winter several years ago. What happened was that these communities up in the Northeast had actually used these authorities and others to block pipelines from being built, so it prevented natural gas from getting to these communities in the Northeast.

Then, they began burning home heating oil in higher volumes. I remind you, Mr. Chairman, home heating oil has a higher emissions profile than natural gas. So, you just made one decision. By blocking pipelines, you became more dependent upon home heating oil, so it resulted in greater emissions or, said another way, greater impacts to the environment.

They ended up having low supplies of home heating oil, so they took it to the next level. These States called their good friend Vladimir Putin—I am not making this up—and had him bring in liquified natural gas from Russia to meet the demands from the Northeast.

Mr. Chairman, maybe my friends across the aisle want to defend the decision to have Russian gas coming in to supply American energy needs whenever we had American energy right there that simply could have been piped in.

Mr. Chairman, I remind you that, according to the National Research Council, pipelines are the safest way to transport energy. By putting something in a pipeline, it has a lower chance of a spill and has lower emissions associated with transportation. This is how you should do it. If you care about the environment, then you want to put energy in a pipeline.

Let me say it again. The chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, Mr. ROUZER from North Carolina, has an amendment to this bill that really returns the interpretation back to congressional intent and back to the way that this provision was exercised for decades so we don't have these ridiculous scenarios like I just described where we are preventing U.S.-generated energy and U.S.-produced energy from meeting Americans' own demands, which, of course, is cheaper, cleaner, and prevents these crazy scenarios where we are calling up Vladimir Putin and asking him to meet America's energy demand.

Mr. Chairman, even Putin found this amusing and was trolling the United States on Twitter and social media.

Do we really want to subject ourselves to this?

Let me say it again: If you care about the environment, then what you actually want to do is put the energy in a pipeline.

We shouldn't get ourselves in a situation like where former White House spokesperson Jen Psaki acknowledged that the production areas that were to be served by the Keystone pipeline were still producing the energy. They were still producing the energy. They were just transporting it through other means, which means truck, barge, and train, all of which, once again, Mr. Chairman, have a higher emissions profile and pose a greater threat to the environment, which I will also note was directly contrary to the justification that the White House gave on why they were shutting down the Keystone pipeline.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I think that it is really important that we are all talking about facts here and that we are recognizing congressional intent and how this very provision has been exercised and used by States for decades and decades.

This recent weaponization to advance or advocate for these energy policies that are resulting—actually, Mr. Chairman, I remind this House that we have watched emissions go up under President Biden, not go down. I keep seeing this sign pop up on the other side that says “polluters over people,” and I am not sure what they are talking about other than perhaps describing some of the very energy policies of this administration that have resulted in greater

emissions, a greater threat to our environment, and, of course, unaffordability issues. We have watched as people have been pushed into energy poverty as we have shut down domestic energy sources.

I encourage, Mr. Chairman, that what we do, instead of getting into this emotional debate and bringing up topics and issues that are not relevant or applicable to the law, is that we stay focused on facts and figures.

Emissions have gone up under this administration versus going down under the previous administration. We have watched as they have advanced or advocated for policies like shutting down the Keystone pipeline and stopping the connection between Marcellus and other American energy sources to communities that are energy starved.

This is resulting in greater emissions in the United States. It is resulting in greater threats to our environment. Most importantly, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that Mr. ROUZER's provision does is it really helps to address the affordability issue.

We have watched as energy prices have skyrocketed under this administration because of their deliberate attempt, which they have said very candidly—they intend to shut down domestic energy production. They have been very clear on that, and they have been incredibly successful.

In fact, you would have to go back to the Truman administration in the 1940s to get back to the same level of acreage leasing for energy production that has been done under this administration.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge adoption of this legislation. I strongly support the amendment that Mr. ROUZER advocated for and Chairman SAM GRAVES is pushing right now.

Mr. Chairman, we need to stick to facts here and make sure that we are making policy decisions based on reality.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, we know that this side of the aisle is not trying to shut down domestic energy production.

In fact, the Inflation Reduction Act made a major investment in clean energy production in the United States to expand the use of renewable energies and renewable energy production. That is one reason why I want people to vote “no” on H.R. 1 because this bill removes some of those incentives.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. STRICKLAND), who is another person who is strongly against this bill.

□ 1815

Ms. STRICKLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, the deceptively named Lower Energy Costs Act. This bill will not lower energy costs, and it won't prevent price gouging because Republicans have no plan to lower energy costs.

Here is what it will do: It will increase the deficit by \$2.4 billion in

handouts to big oil and gas. It will worsen the climate crisis, and it ignores the future of our country's clean energy workforce.

Republicans are more focused on undoing Democratic accomplishments—which, by the way, have already created over 100,000 jobs—than helping the American people. Polluters over people.

This bill forces the government to lease government land to oil and gas companies even if those companies don't plan to use it. This bill will allow anyone to stake a mining claim on our public lands for less than \$10 an acre, even if they haven't discovered any minerals. After that, any mining activity, including dumping toxic mining waste, is considered the highest and best use of those lands.

My Republican colleagues will claim that this bill supports permitting. If you look closely, that simply is not true. The main barrier for getting permits approved is staffing levels. There simply aren't enough staff to get permits approved.

However, I have good news. Democrats have already secured \$1 billion in the Inflation Reduction Act for Federal agency permitting offices, which will address this issue and is expected to drastically shrink the timelines for permitting without sacrificing safety. The Republican bill fails to address these issues.

When Democrats were in charge of the House, we passed transformative legislation to lower the deficit, address climate change, create good union jobs, and actually improve the lives of the American people. We put people over polluters.

Instead of helping our constituents, this bill will weaken State and Tribal authority under section 401 of the Clean Water Act. This section was meant to protect communities and water resources by giving them a voice when projects planned to impact their borders. This bill, though, allows special interests to override what Tribal nations and States know is best for their own communities.

In the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, my colleague, Representative HUFFMAN offered an amendment to keep Tribal rights intact under section 401 guidelines, but House Republicans chose again not to prioritize the people.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. STRICKLAND. Mr. Chair, I will remind my colleagues that these protections are meant to prevent environmental disasters. We see all across the country radioactive water spills, water crises, chemical pollutants seeping into groundwater and poisoning communities.

These catastrophes are not just tragic, they are preventable. It is the American people, especially

marginalized communities, who are left with the consequences.

We can make bipartisan strides to protect American energy and security. We can promote innovation without sacrificing our environment or State and Tribal rights. Unfortunately, this is not what the majority has brought to us. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things I like to do in the Capitol is learn about the individuals who came before us and the wisdom and the knowledge that they possessed.

DANIEL WEBSTER served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1823–1827. He is considered one of the great orators in the U.S. House. He actually also served in the other Chamber. A very good quote of his went on to say, “Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth our powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered.”

That individual is the only individual that is quoted here in this Chamber, DANIEL WEBSTER, right up there on the wall above the dais. That first part is what says it all, “Let us develop the resources of our land.” That is exactly what we are trying to do so that we can be energy dependent on ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER) will manage the remainder of the time for the majority.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of clean water and in opposition to H.R. 1.

I proudly represent New York’s Hudson Valley, the birthplace of the modern environmental movement.

In 1962, community members fought back against a massive, dirty power plant on Storm King Mountain, overlooking my alma mater at West Point, that would have pumped toxic chemicals into our Hudson River.

Ultimately, that fight led to the passage of the National Environmental Policy Act, landmark legislation that to this day protects and preserves access to clean water, air, and soil.

Tragically, my community has a long and well-documented history of big corporations dumping toxic pollutants, particularly PFAS, in our waterways. While there are many reasons I oppose this bill, I rise today to speak on this aspect, in particular.

You would think that keeping toxic chemicals out of our water and away from our kids would be a priority for everyone in this body.

Sadly, after reading this bill, that is clearly not the case. Rather than working to help families dealing with water poisoned by these forever chemicals, my colleagues are trying to pass legislation that will actually increase the prevalence of these toxins.

Every single day in my district, we have kids in Newburgh and seniors in Middletown who cannot access clean water. Asthma rates across my district greatly outpace the national average because of these very pollutants. The Hudson River, which provides drinking water for over 100,000 of my constituents, is still overrun with PCBs and PFAS. To introduce a bill that allows more PFAS and other contaminants into our water without any consideration of safety is an insult to my community and to the American people.

I will vote against this bill.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, which includes the Water Quality Certification and Energy Project Improvement Act. That bill is the one that I introduced alongside my friend and colleague from Louisiana, Mr. GARRET GRAVES.

One of many key components in this package, this specific part of the bill helps ensure development of our Nation’s energy infrastructure at a time when it is most necessary. This is accomplished by clarifying that projects subject to section 401 of the Clean Water Act are approved or denied based on water quality alone.

Unlike what my colleagues have been saying on the other side of the aisle that we are going to permit dirty water, et cetera, et cetera, if it is related to water, guess what, section 401 still applies.

The water quality certification process has been and continues to be weaponized by certain States to stifle important energy projects they oppose, particularly pipelines, for political reasons completely unrelated to water quality and outside the scope and the intent of the Clean Water Act. That is all this particular provision addresses.

Instead of fairly analyzing a project based on the Federal standards set forth by Congress, what has happened is States on the East and West Coast have increasingly weaponized section 401 for their own ideological purposes, again totally and completely unrelated to water quality.

Here are some examples: In my home State of North Carolina, the Mountain Valley Southgate project was denied, not because of water quality but because the deciding bureaucrats hold an inherent opposition to the project as a whole.

Projects in Washington and New York have been denied due to noise and cultural resources. Nothing to do with water quality.

These are just a few examples of the weaponization of section 401 of the Clean Water Act statute.

The language that is included here in this package quite simply will end this abuse.

At a time when American energy production and distribution is under tremendous assault from some in this country, ensuring that America can build the energy infrastructure necessary to responsibly utilize our natural resources, unleash American energy independence, and lower costs for American families is a top priority that this broader bill achieves.

Let me put it this way: Low cost, reliable energy is fundamental to prosperity. It isn’t the only critical aspect necessary for a nation and her people to be prosperous, but it is awfully hard for a nation to be prosperous without it.

Low cost and reliable energy helps America to produce more goods and therefore put downward pressure on inflation, and, boy, do we need all the help we can get. It will enable America to be energy dominant again, increasing American strength abroad. Put another way, it is critical to our economy, our food security, and our national security. That is why this legislation is so badly needed at this critical time in American history.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the Lower Energy Costs Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. SYKES).

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Chair, I rise today to put on the RECORD my opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act, for the many unnecessary and unhelpful provisions that would jeopardize the health and well-being of Ohio’s 13th Congressional District and communities across this great Nation.

I find it hard to believe that the bill designated as H.R. 1, the priority bill that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are uplifting, would increase the national deficit all while endangering our communities by creating unsafe drinking water. That is the priority, increasing the national debt and making us less safe.

Everyone here agrees that we must ensure that the Federal Government is approving domestic energy projects safely and quickly, and we can all agree that the current permitting process leaves much to be desired. However, this process should not come at the expense of the communities who simply want clean drinking water.

I have been in Congress, Mr. Chair, for about 3 months, and this is at least the second time this body has rejected clean water. All of this in the backdrop of a train derailment in East Palestine, Ohio, just about 40 miles from my district. We know pollution knows no boundaries, particularly no congressional boundaries. Whether it is East Palestine or Portage County where I represent, I simply cannot stand silent as polluters attempt to poison our water.

Further, Mr. Chair, I have listened to accusations of activist Governors who

would weaponize provisions of the Clean Water Act. For that reason, States like mine, Ohio, with a Republican Governor, Republican statewide leaders, and a Republican supermajority in the legislature should not decide how to protect the people of our State. Again, I am shocked about the total disregard of the people of Ohio simply to protect polluters.

Mr. Chair, my community elected me to find bipartisan solutions, not pollute their water or pursue partisan politics, and that is why I offered an amendment that would allow States to decide what they thought was best for their community, and particularly in a State like Ohio where there is a train derailment that has jeopardized the water quality and safety in Ohio. However, that amendment was rejected.

There is nothing partisan about wanting to make sure our children and our neighbors can drink a glass of water without worrying if chemicals like vinyl chloride are also being consumed. Time and time and time again, my colleagues are promoting and protecting polluters at the expense of our people, and I simply refuse to vote for this bill.

□ 1830

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Ms. TOKUDA).

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Chair, I rise today to oppose H.R. 1, which puts corporations over people.

Instead of focusing on the needs of the American people and combating the climate crisis, this bill is a shameful giveaway to polluters through loopholes and industry handouts.

In Hawaii, we view the environment as more than just a resource. It is a sacred responsibility, our kuleana, to ourselves and to future generations.

From ancient times, Native Hawaiians have sought balance from mauka to makai, the mountains to the sea, understanding the intimate connections we have to our precious, life-giving resources. This is the kind of future we should be striving for, one that promotes community and fosters responsible use of natural resources.

Everyone deserves to have a seat at the table when it comes to proposed projects that could pollute their water and air, especially underserved communities and communities of color, which have historically borne the brunt of industrialization, resulting in disproportionate impacts to their health and safety.

This bill does the opposite. In addition to shortening public comment periods, this bill would block lawsuits from anyone who did not participate in the comment period. Communities likely do not even know what projects are permitted, let alone the consequences of those permits, until well after the new proposed comment periods.

The responsibility should be on developers and projects to win support from communities based on their merits and through meaningful public engagement. Instead, this bill puts the burden on ordinary, hardworking Americans to fight for their basic right to clean air and water.

I urge my colleagues to do what is pono, what is right, and put our families, our keiki and our kupuna, above corporate profits and vote "no" on the polluters over people act.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to some comments from my friends on the other side, and I am just going to share some examples of how section 401 of the Clean Water Act has been weaponized. Some of these I touched on a little earlier, and some of these have yet to be stated, as far as I know.

In Oregon, a proposed liquified natural gas pipeline and export terminal, which would have had the capability to liquefy over 1 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day, was blocked by that State. The reason? After giving the project applicants the runaround, Oregon denied the certification, citing incomplete information given to the State.

Once again, that was a project that was estimated to have generated up to \$100 million in revenue annually, blocked, just like that.

Despite FERC finding that the project's plan for environmental mitigation and impact minimization was satisfactory, Oregon denied certification based on reasons outside the scope of the CWA, the Clean Water Act.

My second example here comes from a proposed natural gas pipeline's 37-mile extension that New York denied. The project would have added enough additional natural gas per day to meet the needs of approximately 2.3 million homes in a region where demand for natural gas is at an all-time high. Additionally, the project would add an estimated \$327.2 million to the region's economy.

Again, in this case, FERC concluded that any long-term effects would be limited to air quality and noise and that all project effects would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Once again, the State forced the project applicants to come back multiple times with more documents, continuing to move the goalposts each time.

When the State finally gave a straight reason for denying the project, they nominally cited "indirect effects on water resources," but none of these were provisions of the Clean Water Act section 401.

Those are just a couple of examples of how water quality wasn't even an

issue. It was other aspects. They were just using the loopholes in the statute to achieve their end.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time. H.R. 1, the bill before us today, is permitting reform in name only, putting polluters who want to fast-track special projects ahead of the public's interests. It includes unnecessary and unwarranted giveaways to fossil fuel and mining industries, and this polluters over people act also repeals historic investment in clean energy and climate change investments passed by the previous Congress.

I agree with the administration's statement on this bill, which called for working in a bipartisan manner to address lowering energy costs and working in a bipartisan manner to reform the permitting process and to address our energy challenges.

I know my colleagues want to speed up project delivery, and I share that goal, but it is not going to be achieved through H.R. 1.

In the last Congress, the House and Senate reached a historic agreement to restore, upgrade, and advance our Nation's interconnected infrastructure networks through the bipartisan infrastructure law, including major investments in improving clean water infrastructure.

A "yes" vote on H.R. 1 begins to pull back on our ability to maintain the promise of those investments. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to consider what real bipartisan work on permitting reform would look like.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, passage of H.R. 1 is critical for boosting our domestic energy production and lowering energy costs for all Americans.

I thank Majority Leader SCALISE for his leadership on this bill, as well as the chairman of the Energy and Commerce and Natural Resources Committees and our own chairman, SAM GRAVES, of Transportation and Infrastructure.

As has been stated, this bill contains many provisions to help streamline the permitting process for energy projects, allowing America to unleash its domestic energy potential.

I am particularly proud of division C of H.R. 1, which passed out of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, that will stop States from using section 401 of the Clean Water Act as an excuse to block critical energy projects.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.

LAMALFA) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAWLER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to lower energy costs by increasing American energy production, exports, infrastructure, and critical minerals processing, by promoting transparency, accountability, permitting, and production of American resources, and by improving water quality certification and energy projects, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-3)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAWLER) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

When I took office 2 years ago, COVID-19 was raging and our economy was reeling. Millions of workers had lost their jobs, hundreds of thousands of businesses closed, supply chains were snarled, and schools were still shuttered. Families across the Nation were feeling real pain. But today, 230 million Americans have been vaccinated. We have created a record 12 million jobs, and unemployment is at a more than 50-year low, with near-record lows for Black and Latino workers and women. Wages are rising, inflation is slowing, manufacturing is booming, and our economy is growing. More Americans have health insurance than ever before, and a record 10 million Americans have applied to start a small business—each application an act of hope. Our economic plan for the Nation is working, and American families are starting to have a little more breathing room.

I ran for President to rebuild our economy from the bottom up and middle out, not from the top down—because when the middle class does well, the poor have a ladder up and the wealthy still do well. We all do well. For too long, though, the backbone of America, the middle class, has been hollowed out. Too many American jobs were shipped overseas. Unions were weakened. Once-thriving cities and towns have become shadows of what they were. My economic vision is about investing in those places and people who have been forgotten. That is what we have done in these historic past 2 years.

Together, the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, CHIPS and Science Act, and Inflation Reduction Act are among the most significant public investments in our Nation's history, expected to draw more than \$3.5 trillion in public and private funding for infrastructure and

industries of the future—including clean energy. It is simple: you cannot be the number one economy in the world unless you have the best infrastructure in the world. So we are finally rebuilding our roads, bridges, railways, ports, airports, water systems, and more to keep our people safe, our goods moving, and our economy growing. We have already announced over 20,000 projects and awards, creating tens of thousands of good-paying union jobs while requiring that all construction materials are made in America. Americans everywhere can take pride in seeing shovels in the ground for that work.

Meanwhile, the CHIPS and Science Act is making sure America once again leads the world in developing and manufacturing the semiconductors that power everything from cellphones to cars. The United States invented those chips, and it is time that we make them at home again so our economy never again relies on chips manufactured abroad. Private companies have already pledged \$300 billion in new investments in American manufacturing, many thanks to this law, and they are breaking ground on facilities that will employ tens of thousands of Americans with good jobs and breathe new life into communities across the United States.

At the same time, we are taking on powerful special interests to cut costs for working families—for example, lowering healthcare and prescription drug costs by extending Affordable Care Act subsidies and capping insulin prices and out-of-pocket drug costs for seniors on Medicare. The Inflation Reduction Act also gives Medicare the power to negotiate drug prices, lowering prices for Americans and saving taxpayers billions of dollars a year. It makes the world's most significant investment in fighting the existential threat of climate change—lowering families' utility bills, building cleaner and more resilient water systems, investing in rural communities, and leading the world to a clean energy economy.

Throughout, we have delivered on our commitment to fiscal responsibility, cutting the deficit by more than \$1.7 trillion in the first 2 years of my Administration—the largest reduction in American history. I have signed into law additional deficit reduction by finally making the wealthy and corporations pay their fair share, including with a new 15 percent minimum tax on billion-dollar corporations, many of which had been paying zero in taxes. We have also stood firm in our commitment to not raise taxes on anyone earning less than \$400,000 a year.

Now, it is time to finish the job, building on the ambitious progress we have made with new investments in America's future. My 2024 Budget is a blue-collar blueprint to rebuild America in a fiscally responsible way that leaves no one behind. The Budget continues lowering costs for families—

with new measures to expand health coverage, cap prescription drug costs, invest in quality child care, build affordable housing, reduce home energy bills, make college more affordable, and more. This Budget protects and strengthens Social Security and Medicare—lifelines that tens of millions of seniors have paid into their whole lives with every paycheck so they can retire with dignity. It rejects any cuts to these programs, extends the solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund by at least 25 years, and invests in service delivery so that seniors and people with disabilities can access the benefits they have earned. This Budget also keeps growing our economy by investing in the foundation of its strength: the American people. That means helping families by providing paid family and medical leave and restoring the full Child Tax Credit, which cut child poverty in half in 2021 to the lowest level in history. It means expanding small business loans; standing up for workers and their fundamental right to organize; investing in science and innovation; expanding access to preschool; and improving pathways to community college, career-connected high schools, and other high-quality job training. It also means working hard to make our communities safer, expanding access to mental healthcare, ending cancer as we know it, and much more.

In addition, this Budget cements our commitment to confronting global challenges and keeping America safe. It outlines crucial investments to out-compete China globally and to continue support for Ukraine in the face of unprovoked Russian aggression. It also continues our work to restore America's global leadership—reviving key alliances and partnerships, strengthening our military, fostering democracy and human rights, protecting global health, honoring our veterans, fixing our immigration system at home, and advancing cybersecurity through implementation of the National Cybersecurity Strategy I just signed.

Importantly, my Budget does all of this while lowering deficits by nearly \$3 trillion over the next decade. We more than fully pay for these investments in our future by asking the wealthy and big corporations to pay their fair share. We propose a billionaire minimum tax, requiring the wealthiest Americans to pay at least 25 percent on all of their income, including appreciated assets—because no billionaire should ever pay a lower tax rate than a school teacher or a firefighter. This Budget also proposes quadrupling the tax on corporate stock buybacks, so companies invest more in production to improve quality and lower prices, and less in buybacks that only benefit shareholders and CEOs. This Budget closes tax loopholes for the wealthy and cracks down on tax cheats, and it once again ensures that no one earning less than \$400,000 a year will pay a penny more in new taxes, period.

Today, our Nation is at an inflection point that will determine our future for decades to come. But because of the investments that we have made, the United States of America is better positioned to lead than any Nation on Earth. The Budget reflects our values as a Nation—a Nation of good people, growing in a new age of possibilities, and standing as a beacon to the world. Together, let us put those values into practice and prove that democracy delivers as we keep building a stronger, fairer economy that leaves no one behind.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2023.

□ 1845

WATER STORAGE IS KEY TO CALIFORNIA'S ABILITY TO WEATHER DROUGHTS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, recently the California Department of Water Resources announced that water deliveries throughout the State Water Project would be increased to 75 percent of requested amounts. Also, the Bureau of Reclamation made a similar announcement on 100 percent in certain districts in northern California.

The State levels have increased from an announced 35 percent earlier on. These increases are possible due to the massive amount of rain and snowpack California has received from a series of winter storms.

Many of our State's reservoirs, once teetering on the brink of being empty, are rapidly filling. While these increased water allocations are good news, there is still a pressing need for more water storage in California.

Sites Reservoir in my district, a project that should already have been built, would already have 1½ million acre-feet of water in it. Raising Shasta Dam farther north only 18 feet would result in 630,000 more acre-feet. One acre-foot of water, for example, is enough to sustain two California families for a whole year.

Improving the flood controls and modernizing some of our water infrastructure would allow us to keep more stormwater. Storage is key for California's ability to weather droughts for more than 1 year. Store the water we get in the winter and we will have it when we need it in the summer.

HONORING THE LIFE OF VALERIE "VAL" MCCAIN

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor and remember the life of a dear friend and an inspiration to central Washington communities, Valerie

"Val" McCain, who unexpectedly passed away this past Sunday.

Val was an incredible leader with over 30 years of industry experience across several continents. At the time of her death, she served as the project director of the Hanford Tank Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant and as senior vice president of Bechtel.

Val was an inspiration to workers across the Hanford site and in the Tri-Cities communities. She also served our local and government communities on boards of the Energy Facility Contractors Group, TRIDEC, The STEM Foundation, and Columbia Industries.

Val's death is a loss for our community, but her leadership and contributions to central Washington will never be forgotten. We should all strive to emulate her engagement and selfless citizenship.

May she rest in peace.

CONGRATULATING COACH BRANDON JERNIGAN

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Coach Brandon Jernigan, the athletic director at Pierce County High School.

Brandon has been named the Georgia High School Association's Region 2A athletic director of the year. He has been a coach for 24 years and has spent the last 15 years at Pierce County High School. For the last 6 years, he has served as Pierce County High School's athletic director.

During his time as athletic director, Pierce County has achieved many notable athletic accomplishments, including the school's first State football championship. He has also overlooked large expansion projects for the football, baseball, and softball fields.

Brandon is much more than just an athletic director. He is a pillar of his community and someone who has made a lasting impact on everyone around him. His impact on our young men and women will be felt for generations to come.

Congratulations on this wonderful accomplishment.

FIGHTING TO REESTABLISH ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, throughout the month of March, the Western Caucus has been highlighting the need for permitting reform in almost every aspect of the Federal Government.

Permitting and regulatory reform have long been a priority for the Western Caucus and it has become even more important in recent months.

As our Nation fights to reestablish energy independence, we need certainty for American energy producers and a reliable process for increased critical mineral mining.

As catastrophic wildfires threaten the West year after year, we need permitting processes that empower State and local land managers to effectively manage our forests and our grasslands.

As rural communities are faced with more and more Federal overreach from the Biden administration, they deserve certainty and transparency. That is why we must reform our broken permitting processes to unlock American investment and unleash the potential of rural America.

Landmark environmental protection laws like NEPA and the ESA have truly gotten out of control. While well intentioned they are, they are now used by serial litigants to stall critical infrastructure and management projects.

These far-left environmental groups use these statutes to drive political wedges and ensure America is dependent on her adversaries. Endless cycles of litigation tie the hands of project developers, of land managers, and of private conservationists, all while posing a serious threat to both our local economies as well as our environment.

As a farmer from the central part of the State of Washington and as chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus, I see how regulations from the Federal Government have disproportionately negatively impacted our rural communities. This is unfair for so many reasons, but the main one being that these are exactly the men and women that we should be empowering.

In rural America, our livelihoods depend on a healthy environment and on our natural resources. We truly have a vested interest in and a storied history of protecting our lands and our waters. We just need the Federal Government to literally get out of our way.

That is why House Republicans have introduced H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, to deliver on our promise to unleash American energy and lower prices for all consumers, regardless of what industry they are engaged in.

H.R. 1 updates our broken permitting process to actually let Americans mine, let Americans farm, let Americans manufacture, to process, and to build so that our country can grow and thrive once more.

Today, I am joined by Western Caucus members from across our country who will shed light on how broke permitting processes throughout the Federal Government have kneecapped

rural communities and how H.R. 1 can help resolve many of these challenges.

In order to truly unleash American potential, we must reform our permitting processes and we will continue to advocate for commonsense policies that will do just that.

As the preeminent voice for rural America on Capitol Hill, we have an expansive membership who have been on the front lines of the crafting of H.R. 1, our top legislative priority. We will continue to highlight the need for permitting reform to get more energy projects online and lower the cost to battle the inflation caused by the Biden administration's reckless agenda. This evening, many of our members of the Western Caucus will be here participating.

I ask the Speaker's indulgence that Mr. STAUBER from Minnesota actually manage the time for our Special Order tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

URGENT NEED FOR PERMITTING REFORM TO SECURE AMERICA'S ENERGY FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the urgent need for permitting reform to secure America's energy future.

H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, will modernize our outdated permitting process for projects and allow us to unlock the full potential of America's energy and mineral resources.

I want to discuss the mining provisions of H.R. 1, which includes my Permitting for Mining Needs Act. The district that I represent in northern Minnesota, Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District, has 95 percent of America's nickel reserve, almost 90 percent of America's cobalt reserve, 75 percent of our platinum group metals, and more than a third of our copper—all of which are minerals needed for our energy security and mineral supply chains.

It is unconscionable that a mining project in my district for these minerals is on year 20 of permitting and litigation.

We have the resources and the workforce here in the United States, we just need the will, the political will, to mine here. Whether it be mining oil and gas, wind or solar energy, we support all of the above and all of the best energy, but you can't have all of the above and all of the best without permitting reform.

We also need permitting reform to build transmission lines, roads, bridges, and more. Take Dairyland Power's Cardinal-Hickory Creek transmission line project in Wisconsin, for example. This 103-mile-long project is

designed to put more wind power on the grid, but is currently locked in year 7 of permitting because just 1.3 miles of it is unlucky enough to touch Federal land.

This is simply unacceptable, and we can and must do better. If we want to establish American mineral independence and dominance and end our current reliance on the Chinese Communist Party, we must pass H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

□ 1900

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.R. 1.

H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, is about increasing domestic production, permitting reform, reversing President Biden's anti-energy agenda, and streamlining energy exports.

To be perfectly frank, the Biden administration has been putting out anti-energy policies since his first week in office. He shut down the Keystone pipeline and halted permits for domestic energy production that we desperately needed.

He drained our Strategic Petroleum Reserve to try to stop the pain from his terrible policies instead of coming up with real solutions.

Just last night, he tweeted that electric cars are the future.

I have never seen an administration so out of touch with the American people, which is exactly why these same people affected by anti-energy policies elected a Republican majority in the House of Representatives.

In the majority, our first priority is to bring down energy costs and increase energy production. The Lower Energy Costs Act is just the first of many crucial energy policies I am looking forward to seeing over the next 2 years.

One of the pieces of legislation that I am looking forward to seeing is the completion of the Mountain Valley pipeline. The Mountain Valley pipeline is a great example of why permitting works and exactly why we need more of it.

In this project's case, the administration isn't the problem. It is the left-wing courts—which are more radical than Joe Biden, which should really tell you something—that are holding up this important pipeline.

When the pipeline is completed, it will be delivering natural gas within months, meaning lower energy prices for Americans as supply will dramatically increase.

There is no time to waste. Remember that energy security is national security.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for those comments. She is spot on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), the executive vice chair of the Western Caucus.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for hosting tonight and for his great work on mining in this country that we need so desperately, especially with some of the ideas that are being pushed forward in the name of climate change.

I appreciate Chairman NEWHOUSE, as well, for organizing this.

What do we know about H.R. 1, the bill that was discussed here all afternoon, known as the Lower Energy Costs Act? It will reform the permitting process across industries, cut down on needless red tape, and help drive down energy costs for Americans.

We heard all afternoon, though, that it is going to be a handout to oil and gas companies—no, it is not; it is going to strip away environmental laws—no, it is not; it will give companies free rein to poison rivers and streams—yes, that is really what we are about here—no, it doesn't do that either.

It is a monumental win for any American who wants to produce energy, use energy, have their costs lowered, have a secure energy supply long term instead of importing it from OPEC, China, or Russia.

The legislation we are talking about, the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, these were signed in the early 1970s by a Republican, Richard Nixon. Republicans know how to do things ecologically soundly, as well. You wouldn't know it from the other side of the aisle, or even the press, but, yes, we are interested in doing things correctly.

Also, there is the reality that people need things. People need energy. People need to stay warm. We need to produce crops in this country instead of importing everything and exporting environmental problems, if they are that, to other countries that do things much dirtier than we ever thought about doing—to the Pacific Rim, China, where have you.

Our natural gas that we produce in this country is extracted during a cleaner process that is even cleaner fuel than what comes out of Russia. That is why it is good if we were partners with Western Europe, exporting natural gas to them instead of them getting it from a pipeline from the Russian bear.

Despite this critical need for an increase in energy supply—the need for the world is going to continue to go up. You may have seen the chart earlier we were using where it keeps going higher and higher. Oil and gas in the rest of the world are going to be part of that.

They are trying to clamp it down in this country. We are the only ones that are going to be economically disadvantaged, compared to other countries around the world, by doing so.

They yell at us about NEPA being untouchable and what we are talking about in H.R. 1 being a heyday for polluters. It is not that at all.

What it does point out is it takes more than a decade to permit a mine, more than a decade to get a new mine

going in America, for all these batteries they are going to want, for all this electrical they are going to want. Canada and Australia can do one in less than 3 years, and they are not ecologically unsound.

These delays and litigation make domestic energy production unprofitable and time consuming, and it is just not going to happen here, okay?

Critical minerals found in our mines are essential for renewable energy infrastructure. Solar panels, vehicle batteries, and charging stations are built with the minerals that are going to have to be either mined in China or, with the help of Mr. STAUBER, maybe they can be mined in this country.

America always has some of the strongest environmental standards. We are not going to shake those. We are just going to make a NEPA process that is cleaner and smoother.

I haven't even got to talk about our forests in California and the West yet. You have to have a NEPA to do the smallest thing, to have access to the forests so you can tend to them, thin them, make them safe, make them long-term healthy, or be able to get at them when fires do start, which they will.

The current process is so cumbersome that it is a barrier to proper management. That is why the smoke plumes that start in my State on a million-acre fire end up on the East Coast, where people have to have health days where they can't go outdoors.

We saw that million-acre Dixie fire in my district. We have seen 70,000 wildfires per year. NEPA does not help the process of thinning timber or even putting a culvert in a forest road without having to do this long study that doesn't tell anybody anything, other than a way to stall things.

I am encouraging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to break away from the status quo. Don't buy into all these scare tactics that it is going to poison the river, the air, and everything else. It doesn't do that.

The regulations are still in place. It just streamlines the process so you can reasonably get something done still with oversight from the Federal agencies, as well as the industries themselves that understand that, these days, it is a really bad idea to go polluting like we did 150 years ago.

I appreciate the time here tonight and the effort everybody is making on H.R. 1.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LAMALFA for his very spot-on comments, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for yielding and the opportunity to spend some time on this program.

Mr. Speaker, today, the gap between rural and urban America has never been wider. As our Nation advances and urban communities flourish, far

too often our rural communities, which are the backbone of this country, get left behind.

Collectively, Hoosiers contribute nearly \$200 billion to the U.S. economy through our agricultural exports, in spite of the onerous and outdated regulations that limit their growth potential.

Across west central Indiana, our farmers and growers continue to express the same sentiment: We need to cut the red tape that limits our producers and get the Federal Government out of the way.

On average, it takes new solar projects a little over 2 years to receive the necessary Federal permits, over 3 years for electricity transmission projects, and over 4 years for new major road projects.

Based on that timeline, Democrats' goal to reduce emissions by 50 percent by 2030 is totally unrealistic and unobtainable. Their own onerous regulations and broken permitting process will be a death knell for their radical climate goals.

The reality is that the current permitting process is limiting our potential and stifling American energy production.

This shouldn't be a partisan issue. We all stand to benefit when we empower rural America to reach their full potential, and who better than the United States to be the world leader in energy?

Until we get out of our own way, we will continue to cede control to countries like China, which lack any semblance of environmental standards or ethical energy processes.

Passing H.R. 1 is a critical step to achieving our goal of unleashing American energy, and until we take substantive action to cut this red tape, the millions of tax dollars Congress dedicates to improving our country's infrastructure will be squandered.

America's energy independence and rural America's success hinge on our ability to create an efficient and modernized permitting process. It is time for us to get the Federal Government out of the way and give rural America the tools they need to continue feeding and fueling this Nation and the world to the very best of their ability.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments that rural America matters. Their voice should be heard in our Nation's Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY).

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, which does something a little unusual for a piece of legislation. It actually does what it says it is going to do, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

It is going to lower costs for Americans and, in particular, my State of California, where we pay the highest energy costs in the country. It will do that by lowering utility bills, by reducing gas prices, and by reducing the cost

of everyday goods by reducing the cost of transport.

It will do this by making our country more energy independent, enhancing our capacity for domestic energy production.

There are a number of other benefits to this, by the way. It will create jobs here in the United States. It will enhance our national security. It is much better for the environment than energy produced elsewhere.

It is the affordability facet that I really want to focus on because my top priority as a member of this new House majority is focusing like a laser on reducing the cost of living for Americans who have been crushed under the weight of runaway inflation.

As background, the first thing that we did in this new Congress was we voted to repeal the 87,000 IRS agents who were hired by the last Congress. This is going to spare countless Americans, middle-class Americans, from highly intrusive audits.

The next month, in February, I managed to secure an opinion from the IRS. This was specific to California taxpayers. This reversed guidance given by the California tax authority saying that you needed to pay taxes on those tax refunds that you got in the mail last year or early this year.

We managed to secure an opinion from the IRS saying you don't have to pay taxes on that, saving Californians several hundred dollars with that step alone.

It is H.R. 1, this bill, the Lower Energy Costs Act, that is the most important step yet to lower the cost of living for people in California and across the country. Here is exactly how the bill did this.

Number one, it is going to reduce your utility bills by repealing \$6.4 billion in taxes on natural gas. This was part of the Biden administration's energy program last year, which, of course, caused gas prices to go over \$7 a gallon in many places. Also part of that was a major tax that was placed on natural gas.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has found that this tax is ultimately paid for by Americans through higher home heating costs and utility bills.

□ 1915

H.R. 1 repeals this tax, and consumers will pocket those savings through lower utility bills.

The second effect of this legislation will be to reduce gas prices, and that is primarily done through reforming our broken permitting process. Now, this might sound like sort of an arcane issue, but it is fundamental to the high, out-of-control cost of gas that we have been dealing with in this country, where we have a broken permitting process that blocks projects for months, for years, often indefinitely, through never-ending Federal reviews, not to mention frivolous litigation.

This bill will streamline the permitting and review process by capping reviews at 1 year for environmental assessments and 2 years for environmental impact statements, more than enough time. There is also going to be a 120-day deadline implemented on filing a lawsuit on final agency actions concerning energy projects.

The bill also requires the Department of the Interior to resume quarterly sales of onshore oil and gas leases, among many other steps, which will unleash the American energy sector, create middle-class jobs, and increase the supply of gas available to reduce prices at the pump.

Finally, it is worth mentioning the other overall effect of this bill, which is to reduce the cost of everyday goods and services. By reducing the cost of gasoline, every good transported to a store, whether it is groceries, furniture, or any other everyday necessities are going to be cheaper to transport, and those savings as well will be passed on to consumers.

I am proud to stand with my colleagues in the new majority in supporting this legislation, in fighting to reduce inflation, and to making the American Dream accessible to more people.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. KILEY for those spot-on words. He demonstrated that H.R. 1 will save the American people money so they have more money in their pockets, so they can take care of their families. He is absolutely right. Higher energy costs for oil and gas equal the rising cost in food prices.

The next speaker is my colleague and friend from the neighboring State of Wisconsin and one of the vice chairs of the Western Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1, we heard that bill today. I had a chance to speak on it, the Lowering Energy Costs Act. This is one of the steps that we can take as this Congress to get the permitting process under control, save money for Americans that seek to go through this process, and have a healthier economy and environment.

In fact, I would ask my colleague from Minnesota: Aren't we all environmentalists these days?

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I am the father of 6 children and Mr. TIFFANY is the father of 3. Nobody controls that term "environmentalists." We are all environmentalists. He is right.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, we all care about the environment. It isn't like 50, 60 years ago. In fact, we live in regions where I think about our paper mills from decades ago where there was sludge that went down those rivers. In fact, I ran our dinner and excursion boat on one of those rivers, the Wisconsin River. People were so surprised when they came on our boat and said: Wow, this used to be covered with

sludge. We didn't see eagles and loons and wildlife like that back in our day, but we do see it now.

The same thing has happened in north Minnesota, hasn't it?

Mr. STAUBER. Absolutely.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, we just heard a statement from the President that was read just before we came here as the Western Caucus, and he talked about the infrastructure bill and other pieces of legislation that are doing these wonders for Americans.

I would just point out a few flaws with what he is saying. If you go to Vilas County in the Seventh Congressional District in Wisconsin, right near where I live, and there is a small town that is attempting to get a road project done via Federal funding with the infrastructure bill. The quote that they have gotten, as a result of having to go through Federal permitting, is \$1.5 million. I think it is to fix 2.6 miles of road.

I went to a local road contractor and asked them: How much would it cost if you didn't have to go through the Federal process?

Half of that, \$750,000.

We are not going to get the bang for our buck and get more projects done, including ones that could benefit the environment, as a result of having to pay far more for that Federal permitting process.

Also, the President talked extensively about the Green New Deal and this great thing that is going to happen to the United States of America. Wisconsin was just warned this last year for the first time that we may be subject to blackouts this summer.

Why is that? Because we are going to intermittent sources of power. We are not replacing our baseload power.

The gentleman next to me from Minnesota knows all about a project that is going on in a community right across from his hometown of Duluth, Minnesota, in Superior, Wisconsin, the Nemadji Trail Project.

You are very familiar with that, aren't you?

Mr. STAUBER. I am.

Mr. TIFFANY. The Nemadji Trail Project is a natural gas project to produce electricity to be able to provide that baseload power, especially if we are going to go to more intermittent sources of power.

Guess what the Biden EPA is doing?

They have brought the hammer down on that project and said: We are going to make you go through this permitting process even longer, which has already been for 5 years. This is nearly a billion-dollar investment to provide reliable, affordable, clean electricity for people that live in the northland of the upper Midwest of Minnesota and Wisconsin. Here, the Biden administration is trying to stop that project. That is what is happening.

I say we can have both a clean environment and a growing economy. In fact, I would say if we don't have a growing economy, we will not have a clean environment.

What funds those environmental projects?

I saw it as a State legislator. What funds that is when we have a robust economy.

I just think about when we had our business, Wilderness Cruises, my wife and I, for 20 years.

When did we do well?

We did well when the industrial economy was doing well, when the paper mills and the various industrial plants were doing well. When they were doing well, we were doing well. When they didn't, we didn't do well.

It is not mutually exclusive, the environment and the economy. Having a healthy environment and a healthy economy go together.

It is time to reform NEPA. These are really modest changes that we are making in the Lowering Energy Costs Act. We are not changing environmental standards. We believe in high environmental standards, but we need to do it in a more expeditious manner.

The gentleman from Minnesota, what did you say, 20 years for the mining project?

Is that the Twin Metals project?

Mr. STAUBER. It is the PolyMet project, NewRange. Twenty years in the permitting process.

Mr. TIFFANY. The Biden administration brought the hammer down on that one also, didn't they?

Mr. STAUBER. And the Twin Metals one, correct.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, how are we going to have transition to this electrified economy? How are we going to do that if we do not have the metals to do it?

We can't. There is no doubt about it.

But let's be really clear. I thought the Speaker did a terrific job today of laying out what the choice is.

Are you on the side of China and Russia, or are you on the side of the United States of America?

That is really the choice. Because we are deciding at this point. With bills like this, we are deciding: Is the 21st century going to be an American century, or is it going to be a communist Chinese century?

The communist Chinese Government has made it very clear, they seek world dominance, they seek to be the country of the 21st century that everyone will turn to, just like America was in the 20th century.

The choice is before us. Is this going to be an American century, the 21st century, just like the 20th century, or not?

If you are on the side of America, you will be voting for the Lowering Energy Costs Act.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. TIFFANY.

Again, this is about modernizing our permitting process without reducing any environmental standards, as he so clearly stated. We appreciate those comments.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, my Western Caucus colleagues have made

it very clear: we need permitting reform.

I thank them for their comments tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 29, 2023, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF REGULATIONS AND TRANSMITTAL FOR CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL

U.S. CONGRESS, OFFICE OF
CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, March 28, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives,
The United States Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 304(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), 2 U.S.C. §1384(b)(3), requires that, with regard to substantive regulations under the CAA, after the Board of Directors ("Board") of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights ("OCWR") has published a general notice of proposed rulemaking as required by subsection (b)(1), and received comments as required by subsection (b)(2), "the Board shall adopt regulations and shall transmit notice of such action together with a copy of such regulations to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following such transmittal."

The OCWR Board has adopted the regulations in the Notice of Adoption of Substantive Regulations and Transmittal for Congressional Approval, which accompany this transmittal letter. The Board requests that the accompanying Notice be published in both the House and Senate versions of the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following receipt of this transmittal. The Board has adopted the same regulations for the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the other covered entities and facilities, and therefore recommends that the adopted regulations be approved by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Any inquiries regarding this notice should be addressed to Patrick Findlay, Executive Director of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, Room LA-200, 110 2nd Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20540; 202-724-9250.

Sincerely,
BARBARA CHILDS WALLACE,
Chair of the Board of Directors, Office of
Congressional Workplace Rights.

Attachment.

FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF
THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL
WORKPLACE RIGHTS

NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF REGULATIONS
AND TRANSMITTAL FOR CONGRES-
SIONAL APPROVAL

Modification of Regulations Extending Rights and Protections Under the Americans with Disabilities Act Relating to Public Services and Accommodations, Notice of Adoption of Regulations and Submission for Approval as Required by 2 U.S.C. §1331, Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, as Amended.

**Procedural Summary:
Issuance of the Board's Initial Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.**

On or about July 26, 2022, the Board of Directors ("the Board") of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights ("OCWR") published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPRM") in the Congressional Record. 168 Cong. Rec. H7158-H7163, S3700-3705 (daily ed. July 26, 2022). The Board, after considering comments to the NPRM, has adopted, and is submitting for approval by the Congress, final modified regulations implementing section 210 of the CAA. As set forth in detail below, the OCWR Board previously adopted regulations implementing section 210 of the CAA in 2016. 162 Cong. Rec. H557-565, S624-632 (daily ed. February 3, 2016). Because Congress has not acted on the Board's request for approval of its 2016 amendments, the Board now resubmits them for congressional approval.

Why did the Board propose these new Regulations?

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, PL 104-1 ("CAA"), was enacted into law on January 23, 1995. The CAA, as amended, applies the rights and protections of fourteen federal labor and employment statutes to covered employees and employing offices within the legislative branch of the federal government. Section 210(b) of the CAA provides that the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations established by the provisions of Titles II and III (sections 201 through 230, 302, 303, and 309) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §§12131-12150, 12182, 12183, and 12189 ("ADA") shall apply to legislative branch entities covered by the CAA. The above provisions of section 210 became effective on January 1, 1997. 2 U.S.C. §1331(h). Title II of the ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of services, programs, or activities by any "public entity." Section 210(b)(2) of the CAA defines the term "public entity" for Title II purposes as any of the listed legislative branch offices that provide public services, programs, or activities. 2 U.S.C. §1331(b)(2). Title III of the ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability by public accommodations and requires places of public accommodation and commercial facilities to be designed, constructed, and altered in compliance with the accessibility standards.

Section 210(e) of the CAA requires the OCWR Board to issue regulations implementing Section 210. 2 U.S.C. §1331(e). Section 210(e) further states that such regulations "shall be the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsection (b) of this section except to the extent that the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section." Id. Section 210(e)

further provides that the regulations shall include a method of identifying, for purposes of this section and for different categories of violations of subsection (b), the entity responsible for correction of a particular violation. 2 U.S.C. §1331(e)(3).

What procedure followed the Board's initial Notice of Proposed Rulemaking?

The July 26, 2022 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking included a thirty day comment period, which began on July 26, 2022. The OCWR received two sets of written comments to the proposed substantive regulations from stakeholders. The Board of Directors has reviewed these comments, has made certain changes to the proposed substantive regulations in response to the comments, has adopted the amended regulations, and is submitting these final regulations for approval by Congress.

What is the effect of the Board's adoption of these substantive regulations?

Adoption of these substantive regulations by the Board does not complete the promulgation process. Pursuant to section 304 of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1384, following the Board's adoption of the regulations, it must transmit notice of such action together with the regulations and a recommendation regarding the method for Congressional approval of the regulations to the Speaker of the House and President pro tempore of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record. This Notice of Adoption of Substantive Regulations and Submission for Congressional Approval completes this step.

What are the next steps in the process of promulgation of these regulations?

Pursuant to section 304(b)(4) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1384(b)(4), the Board of Directors is required to "include a recommendation in the general notice of proposed rulemaking and in the regulations as to whether the regulations should be approved by resolution of the Senate, by resolution of the House of Representatives, by concurrent resolution, or by joint resolution." The Board has adopted the same regulations for the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the other covered entities and facilities, and therefore recommends that the adopted regulations be approved by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Has the Board previously adopted regulations implementing section 210 of the CAA?

Yes. The first ADA regulations implementing section 210 of the CAA were adopted by the Board and published on January 7, 1997, 142 Cong. Rec. H10676-10711, S10984-11019 (daily ed. September 19, 1996) and 143 Cong. Rec. S30-61 (daily ed. January 7, 1997), after providing notice, and receiving and considering comments in accordance with section 304 of the CAA. No congressional action was taken and thus the 1997 regulations were not issued. Revised regulations were adopted by the Board and published on February 3, 2016, after providing notice, and receiving and considering comments in accordance with section 304 of the CAA. 160 Cong. Rec. H7363 & 160 Cong. Rec. S5437 (daily ed., Sept. 9, 2014), 162 Cong. Rec. H557-565, S624-632 (daily ed. February 3, 2016). No congressional action was taken and thus the regulations were not issued. Because Congress has not acted on the Board's request for approval of its 2016 amendments, the Board now resubmits them for congressional approval.

The Board's Responses to Comments:

A. Commenters' incorporation of 2014 comments

Both commenters incorporated by reference comments submitted in response to the Board's 2014 ADA NPRM. In the 2022

NPRM, the Board only solicited comments on the modifications being made to the ADA regulations adopted in 2016. Because the Board has already considered all of the comments made to the 2014 ADA NPRM and responded to them in its 2016 ADA Notice of Adoption, the Board will not further respond to those comments at this time. 162 Cong. Rec. H557–565, S624–632 (daily ed. February 3, 2016).

The Board notes that the Department of Justice (“DOJ”) regulations now incorporated by reference into the regulations being adopted under section 210 of the CAA have not undergone drastic changes since the opportunity for comments pursuant to the 2014 ADA NPRM. The DOJ regulations, originally published on July 26, 1991 and revised on September 15, 2010, have since undergone only specified changes explained in detail in the July 2022 NPRM involving the definition of “disability” as well as movie theater accessibility. The few changes to the pertinent Department of Transportation (“DOT”) regulations since 2014 are described in detail in the July 2022 NPRM as well, and relate to public transportation entities’ obligation to make reasonable modifications.

The Board has modified section 2.102, regarding rules of interpretation, to specify that both the Board’s 2016 Notice of Adoption and the instant Notice of Adoption shall be used to interpret the regulations and shall be made part of these Regulations as Appendix A.

B. Removal of substantive regulations in favor of procedural rules to govern procedure

Both commenters expressed concern over the Board’s proposal to remove certain substantive regulations in favor of procedural rules to govern unique procedural issues in implementing the ADA mandate under the CAA. Unlike in 2016, the Board’s substantive regulations no longer address the procedures used to implement the two unique statutory duties imposed by the CAA upon the General Counsel of the OCWR (“General Counsel”) that are not imposed upon the DOJ and DOT: (1) the investigation and prosecution of charges of discrimination using the Office’s mediation and hearing processes (section 210(d) of the CAA) and (2) the biennial ADA inspection and reporting obligations (section 210(f) of the CAA). The Board has determined that the procedures relating to these duties are best and properly implemented through amendments to the OCWR’s Procedural Rules.

Both commenters suggested that this approach is in direct contradiction to the statutory requirement in 2 U.S.C. §1331(e)(1) that the Board use the procedures of 2 U.S.C. §1384 to adopt substantive regulations to implement section 210 of the CAA, rather than the simpler standard for adopting procedural rules under 2 U.S.C. §1383. The Board has determined that rules relating to procedures belong in the procedural rules, not the substantive regulations. Nothing in the CAA prevents the Executive Director, subject to the approval of the Board, from adopting procedural rules pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §1383 with respect to any particular part of the CAA. Section 1383 does not prescribe what subjects may be addressed in the procedural rules, beyond that they are “rules governing the procedures of the Office.” 2 U.S.C. §1383(a). Indeed, as the Rules’ Scope states, “These Rules of the [OCWR] govern the procedures for considering and resolving alleged violations of the laws made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA), as amended by the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act of 2018 (CAARA).” Procedural Rules of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights as Amended

June 2019, §1.01. The Board notes that (1) the investigation and prosecution of charges of discrimination using the Office’s mediation and hearing processes and (2) the biennial ADA inspection and reporting obligations relate to “the procedures of the Office,” the CAA’s only requirement for the content of OCWR’s Procedural Rules. 2 U.S.C. §1383(a).

Both commenters suggested that issuing procedural rules relating to section 210 would deny Congress the authority to assess whether the Board has properly defined the scope of powers it intended to give the General Counsel. The Board responds by noting that the CAA’s process for adoption of procedural rules includes publication in the Congressional Record of a notice of proposed rulemaking and a comment period of at least 30 days after publication before adopting rules. 2 U.S.C. §1383(b). Thus, when the Board proposes procedural rules relating to the ADA, employing offices and other parties will have an opportunity to review the proposed procedural rules and provide comments. At this time, the Board has not determined whether the proposed procedures will be the same as what was proposed in the 2016 ADA Notice of Adoption.

C. Concerns relating to specific regulations incorporated by reference

1. §35.105 (Self-evaluation)

One commenter suggested that incorporation of section 35.105 regarding self-evaluation would impose on covered entities an obligation not included in or authorized by the CAA, and that the CAA does not authorize the Board to delegate the General Counsel’s inspection duty to covered entities. Section 35.105 was adopted by the Board in 1997 and 2016. 143 Cong. Rec. S30–61 (daily ed. January 7, 1997) and 162 Cong. Rec. H557–565, S624–632 (daily ed. February 3, 2016). Because the Board’s 1997 and 2016 regulations were adopted pursuant to the CAA’s procedures for proposing and approving substantive regulations, including a comment period of 30 days after publication of the proposed regulations in the Congressional Record, and because the Board has not reopened the comment period on the 2016 adopted regulations that have not been modified, as indicated in the NPRM, the Board will not and has not considered additional comments on those adopted regulations.

The Board notes that its adoption in 1997 and 2016 of section 35.105’s self-evaluation obligation merely incorporates a DOJ regulation that clarifies a legal duty imposed by the ADA as applied by the CAA and that helps ensure covered entities remain accessible even when the General Counsel is unable to inspect a particular facility. By adopting section 35.105 in 1997 and 2016, the Board did not delegate the General Counsel’s inspection duty to covered entities (which, as the commenter correctly notes, is not authorized under the CAA). The General Counsel, in accordance with section 210(f)(1) of the CAA (2 U.S.C. §1331(f)(1)), inspects the facilities of covered entities to ensure compliance with section 210(b) at least once each Congress; adoption of section 35.105 has not changed this. Nor does the General Counsel’s inspection responsibility under 2 U.S.C. §1331(f)(1) relieve employing offices of one of their primary duties under the ADA as applied by the CAA: to identify and remove barriers to access.

The Board additionally notes that adoption of section 35.105’s self-evaluation obligation promotes increased accessibility of legislative branch facilities. Due to very limited inspection resources, the General Counsel is unable to conduct ADA inspections of every facility used by covered entities each Congress. The General Counsel is unable to inspect all of the facilities located in the

Washington, D.C. area, much less all of the facilities used by the district and state offices that are also covered by Section 210 of the CAA. In light of the General Counsel’s limited resources and the large number of facilities that are covered by the CAA, the General Counsel must prioritize its ADA inspections. Adoption of section 35.105 clarifies that the duty of covered entities to identify and remove barriers to access includes a duty to self-evaluate their compliance with the ADA as applied by CAA.

2. §35.107 (Designation of Responsible Employee)

A commenter suggested that the Board’s modification of section 35.107 to impose a duty to designate an employee to coordinate ADA responsibilities on the “House of Representatives” as a body and the “Senate” as a body is not supported by good cause because those bodies are not among the covered entities enumerated in 2 U.S.C. §1331(a). Accordingly, the Board has changed its modification of section 35.107 to more closely reflect the language of 2 U.S.C. §1331(a). Deletions are marked with square [brackets] and added text is within angled <<[brackets]>>. Therefore, if these regulations are approved by Congress as adopted, the deletions within square brackets will be removed from the regulations and the added text within angled brackets will remain.

A commenter suggested that the duty section 35.107 would impose on covered entities employing 50 or more employees—to designate an employee “to coordinate its efforts to comply with and carry out its responsibilities under this part”—is not included in or authorized by the CAA.

The Board notes that section 35.107, without modification, was adopted by the Board in 1997 and 2016 pursuant to the CAA’s procedures for proposing and approving substantive regulations 143 Cong. Rec. S30–61 (daily ed. January 7, 1997) and 162 Cong. Rec. H557–565, S624–632 (daily ed. February 3, 2016). Since the Board has already responded to this comment in its 2016 Notice of Adoption, no further response is warranted at this time.

The Board additionally notes that the duty imposed by section 35.107 is, in fact, included in and authorized by the CAA: Section 210(e) of the CAA requires that the regulations issued by the OCWR Board, pursuant to section 304 of the CAA, “shall be the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsection (b) [of section 210 of the CAA][.]” 2 U.S.C. §1331(e). It is pursuant to this requirement of the CAA that the Board adopted section 35.107 in 1997 and 2016, and does so again now.

3. §36.206 (Retaliation)

The Board has not responded to comments regarding this regulation because it has not been incorporated into the adopted regulations. The Board intends to propose that Congress amend the CAA to incorporate section 503 of the ADA, on which 28 C.F.R. §36.206 is based.

4. Architectural Barriers Act Accessibility Standards (“ABAAS”) §F202.6 (Leases)

One commenter suggested that incorporation of §F202.6 is inconsistent with the Board’s authority under 2 U.S.C. §1384 of the CAA and does not consider current appropriations, procurement, and leasing practices and requirements of the House. Section F202.6 was adopted by the Board in 2016. 162 Cong. Rec. H557–565, S624–632 (daily ed. February 3, 2016). Because the Board’s 2016 regulations were adopted pursuant to the CAA’s procedures for proposing and approving substantive regulations, including a comment

period of 30 days after publication of the proposed regulations in the Congressional Record, and because the Board has not reopened the comment period on the 2016 adopted regulations that have not been modified, as indicated in the NPRM, the Board has not considered comments to regulations already adopted.

The Board also notes that the recent comments to §F202.6 are largely the same as those made in response to its 2014 NPRM and that its response remains the same as stated in the 2016 Notice of Adoption, which is summarized as follows:

This Access Board regulation is based on 36 C.F.R. §1190.34 (2004) which since July 23, 2004 has been incorporated into the Access Board's Architectural Barriers Act Accessibility Guidelines ("ABAAG"). The ABAAG became the ABA Accessibility Standards ("ABAAS") on May 17, 2005 when the General Services Administration adopted them as the standards. See 41 C.F.R. §102-76.65(a) (2005). This regulation provides that buildings and facilities leased with federal funds shall contain certain specified accessible features (including at least one accessible route to primary function areas, accessible toilet facilities, and accessible parking spaces). Buildings or facilities leased for 12 months or less are not required to comply with the regulation as long as the lease cannot be extended or renewed.

Under §F202.6, "Buildings or facilities for which new leases are negotiated by the Federal government after the effective date of the revised standards issued pursuant to the Architectural Barriers Act, including new leases for buildings or facilities previously occupied by the Federal government, shall comply with F202.6." F202.6 then proceeds to describe the requirements for an accessible route to primary function areas, toilet and bathing facilities, parking, and other elements and spaces.

The Access Board's leasing regulation implements a key provision of the Architectural Barriers Act ("ABA") which Congress originally passed in 1968 and amended in 1976 to require accessibility of facilities leased (in addition to those owned) by the federal government. Since 1976, a hallmark of federal policy regarding people with disabilities has been to require accessibility of buildings and facilities constructed or leased using federal funds. Although, in the CAA, Congress required legislative branch compliance with only the public access provisions of the ADA rather than the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 or the ABA, the ADA itself was enacted in 1990 to expand the access rights of individuals with disabilities beyond what was previously provided by the Rehabilitation Act and the ABA. One of the sections of the ADA that Congress incorporated into the CAA is Section 204. Section 204 requires that the regulations promulgated under the ADA with respect to existing facilities "shall be consistent" with the regulations promulgated by the DOJ in 28 C.F.R. Part 39. 42 U.S.C. §12134(b). Under 28 C.F.R. §39.150(b), a covered entity is required to meet accessibility requirements to the extent compelled by the ABA and any regulations implementing it.

As the commenter noted, when the DOJ promulgated its ADA regulations in 1991, it stated in its guidelines that it had intentionally omitted a regulation that required public entities to lease only accessible facilities because to do so "would significantly restrict the options of State and local governments in seeking leased space, which would be particularly burdensome in rural or sparsely populated areas." 29 C.F.R. Pt. 35, App. B. In these same guidelines, however, the DOJ also noted that, under the Access Board's regulations, the federal government may not lease facilities unless they meet the

minimum accessibility requirements specified in 36 C.F.R. §1190.34 (2004) (and now in ABAAG §F202.6). This is true even if the facilities are located in rural or sparsely populated areas. The commenter did not provide any specific examples of how complying with a regulation regarding leased facilities otherwise applicable to the federal government would be unduly burdensome. Since the supply of accessible facilities has increased during the past thirty-one years through alterations and new construction, the burdensomeness of this regulation is certainly much less than it was in 1991.

The commenter also noted that attempting to apply the ABA to cover district office leases entered into by Members of Congress could result in violations of both the Antideficiency Act, 31 U.S.C. §1341, and the Adequacy of Appropriations Act, 41 U.S.C. §11, where an individual Member office does not have funding to address potential non-compliance with ABA standards. The Board reiterates its 2016 response to the similar comment received in response to the 2014 NPRM, that under the current House rules a Member may not use representational funds to obtain reimbursement for capital improvements and this might affect the removal of barriers in facilities that are inaccessible. The proposed regulation does not require that any Member specifically pay for alterations to ensure compliance with ABA standards. Instead, prior to entering into a lease with a Member for a facility that is in need of alterations to meet the minimum accessibility requirements, the landlord is obligated to make the needed alterations as a condition of doing business with Congress. While it is likely that the landlord will recover some of the costs associated with these alterations by increasing the rent paid by federal tenants, Congress determined when it amended the ABA to provide coverage for all leased facilities that the increased cost associated with requiring the federal government to lease only accessible facilities would be minimal and well worth the benefit gained by improving accessibility to all federal facilities. H.R. Rep. No. 1584-Part II, 94th Cong., 2d Sess. 9, reprinted in 1976 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News 5566, 5571-72. The Board notes that one of the most common ADA public access complaints received by the OCWR General Counsel from constituents relates to the lack of ADA access to spaces being leased by legislative branch offices. Given the frequency of these complaints and the clear Congressional policy embodied in the ABA requiring leasing of only accessible spaces by the United States, the Board finds good cause to adopt the Access Board's regulation formerly known as 36 C.F.R. §1190.34 (2004) and now known as §F202.6 of the ABAAG and the ABAAS. Because, under section 210(e)(2) of the CAA, the Board is authorized to adopt a regulation that does not follow the DOJ regulations when it determines "for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section," the Board has decided to require the leasing of accessible spaces as required in §F202.6 of the ABAAS.

In an additional comment that is somewhat different from the comments received in 2014, the commenter noted that the method of incorporation of §F202.6 Leases is problematic because the subsection includes language that is not relevant to House offices and because adoption of only §F202.6 fundamentally distorts the intended scope of application of the requirements set forth in that subsection. The Board notes that this method of incorporation is inherent in the way the CAA incorporates the ADA. Rather

than incorporate the ADA in its entirety, the CAA incorporates select sections of the ADA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(b)(1). The CAA further obligates the Board's regulations to be the same as the DOJ and DOT regulations promulgated to implement those select sections (except to the extent that the Board may determine that a modification would be more effective in implementing ADA public access protections). 2 U.S.C. §1331(e)(2). Congress therefore did not intend that the ADA regulations applicable to the executive branch would apply wholesale through the CAA, but rather that only specific regulations would be adopted. Accordingly, the Board has only adopted specified regulations incorporated from 28 C.F.R. Parts 35 and 36, 49 C.F.R. Parts 37 and 38, and, with the adoption of §F202.6, the Architectural Barriers Act Accessibility Standards.

Adopted Regulations:

PART 1—MATTERS OF GENERAL APPLICABILITY TO ALL REGULATIONS PROMULGATED UNDER SECTION 210 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995 AS AMENDED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995 REFORM ACT

§ 1.101 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

§ 1.102 DEFINITIONS

§ 1.103 AUTHORITY OF THE BOARD

§ 1.104 METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING THE ENTITY RESPONSIBLE FOR CORRECTING VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 210

§ 1.101 Purpose and scope.

(a) CAA. Enacted into law on January 23, 1995 and amended on December 21, 2018, the Congressional Accountability Act ("CAA") in Section 210(b) provides that the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations established by sections 201 through 230, 302, 303, and 309 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §§12131-12150, 12182, 12183, and 12189 ("ADA"), shall apply to the following entities:

- (1) each office of the Senate, including each office of a Senator and each committee;
- (2) each office of the House of Representatives, including each office of a Member of the House of Representatives and each committee;
- (3) each joint committee of the Congress;
- (4) the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services;
- (5) the United States Capitol Police;
- (6) the Congressional Budget Office;
- (7) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (including the Botanic Garden);
- (8) the Office of the Attending Physician;
- (9) the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights; and
- (10) the Library of Congress.

Title II of the ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of public services, programs, activities by any "public entity." Section 210(b)(2) of the CAA provides that for the purpose of applying Title II of the ADA the term "public entity" means any entity listed above that provides public services, programs, or activities. Title III of the ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability by public accommodations and requires places of public accommodation and commercial facilities to be designed, constructed, and altered in compliance with accessibility standards. Section 225(e) of the CAA provides that, "[e]xcept where inconsistent with definitions and exemptions provided in [this Act], the definitions and exemptions of the [ADA] shall apply under [this Act]." 2 U.S.C. §1361(e)(1).

(b) Purpose and scope of regulations. The regulations set forth herein (Parts 1 and 2) are the substantive regulations that the Board of Directors of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights has promulgated

pursuant to section 210(e) of the CAA. Part 1 contains the general provisions applicable to all regulations under section 210 and the method of identifying entities responsible for correcting a violation of section 210. Part 2 contains the list of executive branch regulations incorporated by reference which define and clarify the prohibition against discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of public services and accommodations.

§ 1.102 Definitions.

Except as otherwise specifically provided in these regulations, as used in these regulations:

(a) *Act* or *CAA* means the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, Pub. L. No. 104-1, amended by Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act, Pub. L. No. 115-397.

(b) *ADA* or *Americans with Disabilities Act* means those sections of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 as amended by the ADA Amendments Act of 2008 incorporated by reference into the CAA in section 210: 42 U.S.C. §§ 12131–12150, 12182, 12183, and 12189.

(c) *Covered entity and public entity* include any of the entities listed in § 1.101(a) that provides public services, programs, or activities, or operates a place of public accommodation within the meaning of section 210 of the CAA. In the regulations implementing Title III, *private entity* includes *covered entities*.

(d) *Board* means the Board of Directors of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights.

(e) *Office* means the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights.

(f) *General Counsel* means the General Counsel of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights.

§ 1.103 Authority of the Board.

Pursuant to sections 210 and 304 of the CAA, the Board is authorized to issue regulations to implement the rights and protections against discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of public services and accommodations under the ADA. Section 210(e) of the CAA directs the Board to promulgate regulations implementing section 210 that are “the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsection (b) except to the extent that the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section.” 2 U.S.C. § 1331(e). Specifically, it is the Board’s considered judgment, based on the information available to it at the time of promulgation of these regulations, that, with the exception of the regulations adopted and set forth herein, there are no other “substantive regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsection (b) [of Section 210 of the CAA]” that need be adopted.

In promulgating these regulations, the Board has made certain technical and nomenclature changes to the regulations as promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation. Such changes are intended to make the provisions adopted accord more naturally to situations in the legislative branch. However, by making these changes, the Board does not intend a substantive difference between these regulations and those of the Attorney General and/or the Secretary of Transportation from which they are derived. Moreover, such changes, in and of themselves, are not intended to constitute an interpretation of the

regulations or of the statutory provisions of the CAA upon which they are based.

§ 1.104 Method for identifying the entity responsible for correction of violations of section 210.

(a) Purpose and scope. Section 210(e)(3) of the CAA provides that regulations under section 210(e) include a method of identifying, for purposes of section 210 of the CAA and for categories of violations of section 210(b), the entity responsible for correcting a particular violation. This section sets forth the method for identifying responsible entities for the purpose of allocating responsibility for correcting violations of section 210(b).

(b) Violations. A covered entity may violate section 210(b) if it discriminates against a qualified individual with a disability within the meaning of Title II or Title III of the ADA.

(c) Entities Responsible for Correcting Violations. Correction of a violation of the rights and protections against discrimination is the responsibility of the entities listed in subsection (a) of section 210 of the CAA that provide the specific public service, program, activity, or accommodation that forms the basis for the particular violation of Title II or Title III rights and protections and, when the violation involves a physical access barrier, the entities responsible for designing, maintaining, managing, altering, or constructing the facility in which the specific public service program, activity, or accommodation is conducted or provided.

(d) Allocation of Responsibility for Correction of Title II and/or Title III Violations. Where more than one covered entity is found to be an entity responsible for correction of a violation of Title II and/or Title III rights and protections under the method set forth in this section, as between those parties, allocation of responsibility for correcting the violations of the ADA may be determined by statute, contract, or other enforceable arrangement or relationship.

PART 2—REGULATIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

§ 2.101 TECHNICAL AND NOMENCLATURE CHANGES TO REGULATIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE.

§ 2.102 RULES OF INTERPRETATION.

§ 2.103 INCORPORATED REGULATIONS FROM 28 C.F.R. PARTS 35 AND 36.

§ 2.104 INCORPORATED REGULATIONS FROM 49 C.F.R. PARTS 37 AND 38.

§ 2.105 INCORPORATED STANDARD FROM THE ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS ACT ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS (“ABAAS”) (MAY 17, 2005).

§ 2.101 Technical and Nomenclature Changes to Regulations Incorporated by Reference.

The definitions in the regulations incorporated by reference (“incorporated regulations”) shall be used to interpret these regulations except: (1) when they differ from the definitions in § 1.102 or the modifications listed below, in which case the definition in § 1.102 or the modification listed below shall be used; or (2) when they define terms that are not used in the incorporated regulations. The incorporated regulations are hereby modified as follows:

(1) When the incorporated regulations refer to “Assistant Attorney General,” “Department of Justice,” “FTA Administrator,” “FTA regional office,” “Administrator,” “Secretary,” or any other executive branch office or officer, “General Counsel” is hereby substituted.

(2) When the incorporated regulations refer to the date “January 26, 1992,” the date “January 1, 1997” is hereby substituted.

(3) When the incorporated regulations otherwise specify a date by which some action

must be completed, the date that is three years from the effective date of these regulations is hereby substituted.

(4) When the incorporated regulations contain an exception for an “historic” property, building, or facility, that exception shall also apply to properties, buildings, or facilities designated as an historic or heritage asset by the Office of the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with its preservation policy and standards and where, in accordance with its preservation policy and standards, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol determines that compliance with the requirements for accessible routes, entrances, or toilet facilities (as defined in 28 C.F.R. Parts 35 and 36) would threaten or destroy the historic significance of the property, building, or facility, the exceptions for alterations to qualified historic property, buildings, or facilities for that element shall be permitted to apply.

§ 2.102 Rules of Interpretation.

When regulations in § 2.103 conflict, the regulation providing the most access shall apply. The Board’s 2016 Notice of Adoption and the instant Notice of Adoption shall be used to interpret these regulations and shall be made part of these Regulations as Appendix A.

§ 2.103 Incorporated Regulations from 28 C.F.R. Parts 35 and 36.

The Office shall publish on its website the full text of all regulations incorporated by reference. The following regulations from 28 C.F.R. Parts 35 and 36 that are published in the Code of Federal Regulations on the date of the Board’s adoption of these regulations are hereby incorporated by reference as though stated in detail herein:

§ 35.101 Purpose and broad coverage.

§ 35.102 Application.

§ 35.104 Definitions.

§ 35.105 Self-evaluation.

§ 35.106 Notice.

§ 35.107 Designation of responsible employee.

But modify as follows:

<<Each entity enumerated at 2 U.S.C. § 1331(a)>> [A *public entity*] that employs 50 or more persons shall designate at least one employee to coordinate its efforts to comply with and carry out its responsibilities under this part, including <<cooperation with an investigation by the General Counsel of a charge alleging noncompliance with the ADA or alleging any actions that would be prohibited by the ADA>> [any investigation of any complaint communicated to it alleging its non-compliance with this part or alleging any actions that would be prohibited by this part]. The public entity shall make available to all interested individuals the name, office address, and telephone number of the employee or employees designated pursuant to this paragraph. <<The entities listed at 2 U.S.C. § 1331(a)(1) (“each office of the Senate, including each office of a Senator and each committee”) may designate one such employee collectively, as may the entities listed at 2 U.S.C. § 1331(a)(2) (“each office of the House of Representatives, including each office of a Member of the House of Representatives and each committee”). The responsible employee designated by the 2 U.S.C. § 1331(a)(1) and (2) entities may be an employee of the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, so long as that employee is responsible to carry out the duties in this section.>>

§ 35.108 Definition of disability.

§ 35.130 General prohibitions against discrimination.

§ 35.131 Illegal use of drugs.

§ 35.132 Smoking.

§ 35.133 Maintenance of accessible features.

§ 35.135 Personal devices and services.

- § 35.136 Service animals.
- § 35.137 Mobility devices.
- § 35.138 Ticketing.
- § 35.139 Direct threat.
- § 35.149 Discrimination prohibited.
- § 35.150 Existing facilities.
- § 35.151 New construction and alterations.
- § 35.152 Jails, detention and correctional facilities.
- § 35.160 General.
- § 35.161 Telecommunications.
- § 35.162 Telephone emergency services.
- § 35.163 Information and signage.
- § 35.164 Duties.

Appendix A to Part 35—Guidance to Revisions to ADA Regulation on Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability in State and Local Government Services.

Appendix B to Part 35—Guidance on ADA Regulation on Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability in State and Local Government Services Originally Published July 26, 1991.

APPENDIX C TO PART 35—GUIDANCE TO REVISIONS TO ADA TITLE II AND TITLE III REGULATIONS REVISING THE MEANING AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DEFINITION OF “DISABILITY” AND OTHER PROVISIONS IN ORDER TO INCORPORATE THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE ADA AMENDMENTS ACT

- § 36.101 Purpose and broad coverage.
- § 36.102 Application.
- § 36.103 Relationship to other laws.
- § 36.104 Definitions.
- § 36.201 General.
- § 36.202 Activities.
- § 36.203 Integrated settings.
- § 36.204 Administrative methods.
- § 36.205 Association.
- § 36.207 Places of public accommodations located in private residences.
- § 36.210 Smoking.
- § 36.213 Relationship of subpart B to subparts C and D of this part.

But modify as follows:

Subpart B of this part << (§ 36.201 through § 36.213) >> sets forth the general principles of nondiscrimination applicable to all entities subject to this part. Subparts C << (§ 36.301 through § 36.310) >> and D << (§ 36.405 through § 36.406) >> of this part provide guidance on the application of the statute to specific situations. The specific provisions, including the limitations on those provisions, control over the general provisions in circumstances where both specific and general provisions apply.

- § 36.301 Eligibility criteria.
- § 36.302 Modifications in policies, practices, or procedures.
- § 36.303 Auxiliary aids and services.
- § 36.304 Removal of barriers.
- § 36.305 Alternatives to barrier removal.
- § 36.307 Accessible or special goods.
- § 36.308 Seating in assembly areas.
- § 36.309 Examinations and courses.
- § 36.310 Transportation provided by public accommodations.
- § 36.402 Alterations.
- § 36.403 Alterations: Path of travel.
- § 36.404 Alterations: Elevator exemption.
- § 36.405 Alterations: Historic preservation.
- § 36.406 Standards for new construction and alterations.

Appendix A to Part 36—Guidance on Revisions to ADA Regulation on Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability by Public Accommodations and Commercial Facilities.

Appendix B to Part 36—Analysis and Commentary on the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design.

Appendix C to Part 36—Guidance on ADA Regulation on Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability by Public Accommodations and in Commercial Facilities Originally Published on July 26, 1991.

Appendix D to Part 36—1991 Standards for Accessible Design as Originally Published on July 26, 1991.

Appendix E to Part 36—Guidance to Revisions to ADA Title II and Title III Regulations Revising the Meaning and Interpretation of the Definition of “Disability” and Other Provisions in Order to Incorporate the Requirements of the ADA Amendments Act.

Appendix F to Part 36—Guidance and Section-By-Section Analysis.

- § 2.104 Incorporated Regulations from 49 C.F.R. Parts 37 and 38.

The following regulations from 49 C.F.R. Parts 37 and 38 that are published in the Code of Federal Regulations on the effective date of these regulations are hereby incorporated by reference as though stated in detail herein:

- § 37.1 Purpose.
- § 37.3 Definitions.
- § 37.5 Nondiscrimination.
- § 37.7 Standards for accessible vehicles.
- § 37.9 Standards for accessible transportation facilities.
- § 37.13 Effective date for certain vehicle specifications.
- § 37.21 Applicability: General.
- § 37.23 Service under contract.
- § 37.27 Transportation for elementary and secondary education systems.
- § 37.31 Vanpools.
- § 37.37 Other applications.
- § 37.41 Construction of transportation facilities by public entities.
- § 37.43 Alteration of transportation facilities by public entities.
- § 37.45 Construction and alteration of transportation facilities by private entities.
- § 37.47 Key stations in light and rapid rail systems.
- § 37.61 Public transportation programs and activities in existing facilities.
- § 37.71 Purchase or lease of new non-rail vehicles by public entities operating fixed route systems.
- § 37.73 Purchase or lease of used non-rail vehicles by public entities operating fixed route systems.
- § 37.75 Remanufacture of non-rail vehicles and purchase or lease of remanufactured non-rail vehicles by public entities operating fixed route systems.
- § 37.77 Purchase or lease of new non-rail vehicles by public entities operating a demand responsive system for the general public.
- § 37.79 Purchase or lease of new rail vehicles by public entities operating rapid or light rail systems.
- § 37.81 Purchase or lease of used rail vehicles by public entities operating rapid or light rail systems.
- § 37.83 Remanufacture of rail vehicles and purchase or lease of remanufactured rail vehicles by public entities operating rapid or light rail systems.
- § 37.101 Purchase or lease of vehicles by private entities not primarily engaged in the business of transporting people.
- § 37.105 Equivalent service standard.

§ 37.161 Maintenance of accessible features: General.

§ 37.163 Keeping vehicle lifts in operative condition: Public entities.

§ 37.165 Lift and securement use.

§ 37.167 Other service requirements.

§ 37.169 Process to be used by public entities providing designated public transportation service in considering requests for reasonable modification.

§ 37.171 Equivalency requirement for demand responsive service operated by private entities not primarily engaged in the business of transporting people.

§ 37.173 Training requirements.

Appendix A to Part 37—Modifications to Standards for Accessible Transportation Facilities.

Appendix D to Part 37—Construction and Interpretation of Provisions of 49 CFR Part 37.

Appendix E to Part 37—Reasonable Modification Requests.

- § 38.1 Purpose.
- § 38.2 Equivalent facilitation.
- § 38.3 Definitions.
- § 38.4 Miscellaneous instructions.
- § 38.21 General.
- § 38.23 Mobility aid accessibility.
- § 38.25 Doors, steps and thresholds.
- § 38.27 Priority seating signs.
- § 38.29 Interior circulation, handrails and stanchions.
- § 38.31 Lighting.
- § 38.33 Fare box.
- § 38.35 Public information system.
- § 38.37 Stop request.
- § 38.39 Destination and route signs.
- § 38.51 General.
- § 38.53 Doorways.
- § 38.55 Priority seating signs.
- § 38.57 Interior circulation, handrails and stanchions.
- § 38.59 Floor surfaces.
- § 38.61 Public information system.
- § 38.63 Between-car barriers.
- § 38.71 General.
- § 38.73 Doorways.
- § 38.75 Priority seating signs.
- § 38.77 Interior circulation, handrails and stanchions.
- § 38.79 Floors, steps and thresholds.
- § 38.81 Lighting.
- § 38.83 Mobility aid accessibility.
- § 38.85 Between-car barriers.
- § 38.87 Public information system.
- § 38.171 General.
- § 38.173 Automated guideway transit vehicles and systems.
- § 38.179 Trams, and similar vehicles, and systems.

Figures to Part 38.

Appendix to Part 38—Guidance Material.

- § 2.105 Incorporated Standard from the Architectural Barriers Act Accessibility Standards (“ABAAS”) (May 17, 2005).

The following standard from the ABAAS is adopted as a standard and hereby incorporated as a regulation by reference as though stated in detail herein:

§ F202.6 Leases.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

EC-651. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s direct final rule — Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation [Docket ID: DoD-2023-OS-0010] (RIN: 0790-AL11) received March 9, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-

121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-652. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Increased Forty-Year Term for Loan Modifications [Docket No.: FR-6263-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AJ59) received March 13, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-653. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting determination under section 7034(1)(5) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2023 (Div. K, P.L. 117-328), pursuant to Public Law 117-103, div. K, title VII, Sec. 7071; (136 Stat. 682); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-654. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting determination under section 7034(1)(5) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2023 (Div. K, P.L. 117-328), pursuant to Public Law 117-103, div. K, title VII, Sec. 7071; (136 Stat. 682); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-655. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a response to the White House Environmental Justice Advisory Council's (WHEJAC) Phase One Scorecard Recommendations Report (Scorecard Report), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. Sec. 6(c); Public Law 92-463, Sec. 6(c) (as amended by Public Law 97-375, Sec. 201(c)); (96 Stat. 1822); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-656. A letter from the Legal Advisor, Office of the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the Office's final rule — Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act (RIN: 0355-AA00) received March 2, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-657. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's FY 2022 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-658. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Prostrate Milkweed and Designation of Critical Habitat [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2021-0041; FF09E21000 FXES111090FEDR 234] (RIN: 1018-BE65) received March 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-659. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status With Section 4(d) Rule for the Upper Coosa River Distinct Population Segment of Frecklebelly Madtom and Designation of Critical Habitat [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2020-0058; FF09E21000 FXES111090FEDR 234] (RIN: 1018-BE87) received March 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-660. A letter from the Acting Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, De-

partment of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule— Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties received March 13, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-661. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Adjustment of Civil Penalties for Inflation (RIN: 1212-AB45) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-662. A letter from the Chair of the Board of Directors, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, transmitting notification of proposed rulemaking, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1384(b)(3); Public Law 104-1, Sec. 304(b)(3); (109 Stat. 29); jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and the Workforce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of March 27, 2023]

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 158. Resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to congressionally appropriated funds to the nation of Ukraine from January 20, 2021 to February 24, 2023 (Rept. 118-29). Referred to the House Calendar.

[Submitted March 28, 2023]

Mr. RESCIENTHALER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 260. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to lower energy costs by increasing American energy production, exports, infrastructure, and critical minerals processing, by promoting transparency, accountability, permitting, and production of American resources, and by improving water quality certification and energy projects, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-30). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1603. A bill to repeal provisions of Public Law 117-169 relating to taxpayer subsidies for home electrification, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-31). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COLLINS (for himself, Mr. PARNETTA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mrs. MCBATH, and Mr. FRY):

H.R. 1818. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow qualified distributions from qualified tuition programs for certain aviation maintenance and commercial pilot courses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 1819. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to limit the exemption from the registration requirements of such Act for persons engaging in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or the fine arts to activities which do not promote the political agenda of a foreign government, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the disclosures of foreign gifts by institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 1820. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to renew the lease of land for operations of the Corona Municipal Airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1821. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate the Texas and New Mexico portions of the future Interstate-designated segments of the Port-to-Plains Corridor as Interstate Route 27, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BERGMAN (for himself and Ms. MACE):

H.R. 1822. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the review of claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1823. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 207 East Fort Dade Avenue in Brooksville, Florida, as the "Specialist Justin Dean Coleman Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1824. A bill to reform the safety net for farmers and ranchers, enhance soil, water, and habitat conservation, encourage beginning farmers and ranchers, strengthen nutrition for Americans, support agriculture research and innovation, reduce food waste, improve animal welfare, and invest in regional food systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. MACE, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 1825. A bill to clarify that the Federal Right to Try law applies to schedule I substances for which a phase I clinical trial has been completed and to provide access for eligible patients to such substances pursuant to the Federal Right to Try law; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DUNN of Florida, and Mr. CARTER of Louisiana):

H.R. 1826. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health

insurance coverage to provide coverage for prostate cancer screenings without the imposition of cost-sharing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 1827. A bill to prohibit the National Institutes of Health from conducting or supporting certain gain-of-function research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CASAR, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Ms. NOR-TON):

H.R. 1828. A bill to protect victims of crime or serious labor violations from removal during Department of Homeland Security enforcement actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 1829. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to convey the Pleasant Valley Ranger District Administrative Site to Gila County, Arizona; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CROW (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NEGUSE, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 1830. A bill to prohibit a Federal firearms licensee from transferring a long gun to a person who the licensee knows or has reasonable cause to believe does not reside in (or if the person is a corporation or other business entity, does not maintain a place of business in) the State in which the licensee's place of business is located; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. KIM of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. STEEL, Ms. MENG, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 1831. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Billie Jean King, an American icon, in recognition of a remarkable life devoted to championing equal rights for all, in sports and in society; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1832. A bill to amend the Afghan Allies Protection Act to provide special immigrant visas to certain Fulbright Scholars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California (for himself, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. BROWN, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. IVEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. KEATING,

Mr. TRONE, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. MENG, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SORENSSEN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. FROST, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1833. A bill to establish in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBTQI+ Peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself, Ms. WILD, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 1834. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to award grants to develop, administer, and evaluate early childhood education apprenticeships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself and Mr. BUCSHON):

H.R. 1835. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the accuracy of market-based Medicare payment for clinical diagnostic laboratory services, to reduce administrative burdens in the collection of data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 1836. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to make technical corrections with respect to ocean shipping authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KUSTOFF (for himself, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BARR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate advance refunding bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BERA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CARSON, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DELUZIO, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TRONE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ROSS, Mr. KILMER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CASE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MENG, Mr. STANTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. OMAR, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CROW, Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Mrs. MCCLELLAN, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr.

VARGAS, Ms. CHU, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. PORTER, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. DOGETT, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. MCGARVEY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. WILIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. NEAL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BASTAN, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. LIEU, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. KEATING, Ms. CARAVEO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MFUME, Ms. BROWN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. IVEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. BALINT, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SORENSSEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. BUSH):

H.R. 1838. A bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. BACON, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. VASQUEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H.R. 1839. A bill to prohibit certain uses of xylazine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CARSON, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEYER, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LIEU, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. PORTER):

H.R. 1840. A bill to address the impact of climate change on agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, House Administration, and Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BACON, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. FALLON, Mr.

HUDSON, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. ZINKE, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, and Mr. MCCORMICK):

H.R. 1841. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to establish a disability benefit offset for Purple Heart recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1842. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to eliminate origination fees on Federal Direct loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. STEEL (for herself, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 1843. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the exemption for telehealth services from certain high deductible health plan rules; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Ms. MACE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution condemning the Russian Federation's kidnapping of Ukrainian children; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GAETZ (for himself, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, and Mr. BIGGS):

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove all United States Armed Forces, other than United States Armed Forces assigned to protect the United States Embassy, from Somalia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE (for herself, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. EVANS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARSON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LIEU, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H. Res. 261. A resolution reaffirming the importance of diplomacy and development in United States-African Union relations, promoting strategic partnerships and shared objectives between the United States and the African Union, and expressing strong support for the successful implementation of the African Continental Free Trade Area; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. FROST, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H. Res. 262. A resolution supporting the teaching of climate change in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PAPPAS, and Ms. TITUS):

H. Res. 263. A resolution condemning Turkey for its illegal occupation of Cyprus and encouraging President Biden to make the resolution of the Cyprus problem a top foreign policy priority; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 1818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution authorizes Congress to lay and collect taxes. This bill amends the Internal Revenue Code.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation does one thing—amends the Internal Revenue Code to expand the list of qualified expenses for 529 plans to include FAA-certified commercial pilot and aircraft technician programs.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 1819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution The single subject of this legislation is: addresses transparency requirements regarding foreign influence in higher education

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 1820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 AND Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is to exempt a local recreational airport, located on Army Corp property, from a Corp policy which would then allow the Corp to renew the lease with the City of Corona which expires in 2036.

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 1821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of U.S. Constitution The single subject of this legislation is: Infrastructure

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 1822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Restores criminal penalties on individuals who attempt to take advantage of Veterans, while preserving the right for Veterans to seek assistance from the private sector when preparing their claim to VA.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Naming a single post office after a fallen hero,

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Agriculture

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is: This legislation clarifies the federal Right to Try statute.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 1826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Health

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 1827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the National Institutes of Health from conducting or supporting certain gain-of-function research, and for other purposes.

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 1828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill expands protections for aliens who are victims of crimes or serious workplace violations.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 1829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 provides Congress with the power to "dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States."

The single subject of this legislation is:

Public Lands

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 1830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, authorizing Congress "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes."

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill restricts the sale or transfer of shotguns and rifles across state lines.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 1831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause XVIII of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Awarding a Congressional Gold Medal to Billie Jean King.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Afghan Allies Protection Act to provide special immigrant visas to certain Fulbright Scholars, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California:

H.R. 1833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 Article 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

Legislating

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 1834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This is a single issue.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 1835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is: healthcare

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 1836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill makes corrections to US cose with respect to ocean shipping authorities and the Federal Maritime Commission.

By Mr. KUSTOFF:

H.R. 1837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation pertains to advanced re-funding for certain municipal bonds.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 1838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Reproductive Health, Civil Rights, Gender Equity

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 1839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Illicit drug interdiction

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 1840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

The single subject of this legislation is:

Climate Change

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 1841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title II of the Social Security Act to establish a disability benefit offset for Purple Heart recipients.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the U.S. Constitution (the Spending Clause)

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to eliminate origination fees on Federal Direct loans.

By Mrs. STEEL:

H.R. 1843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Health Care

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. ALLRED and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 29: Ms. DE LA CRUZ.

H.R. 38: Mr. BANKS.

H.R. 51: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.

H.R. 79: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. DONALDS.

H.R. 82: Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. MOSKOWITZ.

H.R. 105: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 107: Mr. BURLISON.

H.R. 167: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 190: Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CLINE, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 233: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 239: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 431: Mr. FLOOD.

H.R. 467: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. BEAN of Florida.

H.R. 533: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 589: Mr. LAWLER, Mr. SELF, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. STEEL, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 594: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 595: Mr. COHEN, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 660: Mr. RYAN, Mr. THANEDAR, and Mrs. FOUSHEE.

H.R. 671: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 683: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.

H.R. 700: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. STEIL.

H.R. 716: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.

H.R. 830: Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 866: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.

H.R. 899: Mr. DONALDS, Mr. CLINE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. SELF, Mr. CRANE, Mr. OGLES, and Mrs. LUNA.

H.R. 949: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 950: Mr. DUNN of Florida.

H.R. 957: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 977: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1091: Mr. RUIZ, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 1097: Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 1116: Mr. MANN and Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1147: Mr. MOLINARO.

H.R. 1192: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 1200: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas and Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 1204: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 1232: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1277: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington and Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 1297: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 1359: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 1434: Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 1452: Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 1482: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.

H.R. 1499: Ms. BROWN, Mr. TRONE, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, and Mr. NICKEL.

H.R. 1525: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1581: Mr. STRONG.

H.R. 1602: Ms. OMAR, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1610: Ms. BUSH and Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 1624: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CARSON, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. POCAN, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1628: Mr. COMER.

H.R. 1629: Mr. COMER.

H.R. 1643: Ms. TOKUDA.

H.R. 1654: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1679: Mr. CRANE and Mr. SELF.

H.R. 1684: Mr. LAWLER.

H.R. 1685: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 1699: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 1709: Mr. BRECHEEN.

H.R. 1723: Ms. SCHOLTEN.

H.R. 1734: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.

H.R. 1753: Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. LAWLER, and Ms. SALAZAR.

H.R. 1769: Mr. BURLISON.

H.R. 1782: Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN and Mr. DUNN of Florida.

H.R. 1784: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.J. Res. 13: Ms. PEREZ.

H.J. Res. 25: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. PELTOLA, and Ms. PLASKETT.

H.J. Res. 33: Mr. CISCOMANI.

H.J. Res. 42: Mr. EDWARDS.

H.J. Res. 45: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. ROY.

H. Res. 77: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 108: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H. Res. 219: Mrs. SYKES and Mr. TONKO.

H. Res. 233: Mrs. LUNA.